

**POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES:
THEIR ROLE IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE
IN WASHINGTON STATE**

November 1985

**POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES:
THEIR ROLE IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE IN WASHINGTON STATE**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. PAC GROWTH	5
II. PAC MEMBERS: WHO ARE THEY?	14
III. GETTING AND SPENDING PAC DOLLARS	26
IV. IDEOLOGICAL PACS IN WASHINGTON.	49
V. PACS AS VIEWED BY THE CANDIDATES	52
VI. PACS AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES.	57
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	66
APPENDIX A. WASHINGTON PACS ACTIVE IN 1984	
APPENDIX B. SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES REPORTED BY 20 LARGEST PACS, 1984	

LIST OF TABLES

1.1	Number of committees registered and active in Washington state, 1976-1984	5
1.2	Biennial changes in number of committees, 1978-1984	6
1.3	PAC expenditures in Washington state, election years 1976-1984.	7
1.4	Contributions to general election legislative candidates by selected large PACs, 1978 and 1984.	9
1.5	Member/contributors reported by selected large PACs, 1978 and 1984.	11
1.6	Year of joining PAC reported by sample of PAC members in Washington state	12
3.1	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, 1984 expenditures	27
3.2	Campaign contributions made by top 20 PACs in 1984	29
3.3	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, 1984 contributions to legislative candidates	33
3.4	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, size of contributions to senate candidates, 1984	34
3.5	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, size of contributions to house candidates, 1984	35
3.6	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, 1984 contributions to legislative candidates, by percentage to Democrats	37
3.7	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, 1984; percentages of total legislative contributions by candidate status	39
3.8	Top 20 PACs in Washington state, winners and losers supported in legislative races, 1984	40
3.9	Contributions to legislative campaigns and caucuses by 10 major PACs, 1974-1984	41
3.10	Percentage of legislative campaign contributions given to Democratic candidates by 10 major PACs, 1978-1984	42

3.11	Total receipts and contributions from PACs by reporting periods as reported by four legislative candidates in 1984	44
5.1	Candidates' responses to statements about PACs	53
5.2	Percentages of PAC officers and candidates agreeing with statements about PACs	55
6.1	Expenditures by committee types, 1976-1984	58
6.2	Campaign contributions made by Washington state party committees, election years 1978 through 1984	59
6.3	Contributions received by Washington state party committees, election years 1978 through 1984	61
6.4	PAC contributions to caucus committees, 1984	62

POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES:
THEIR ROLE IN CAMPAIGN FINANCE IN WASHINGTON STATE

INTRODUCTION

This study is a look at political action committees and their impact on election financing in the state of Washington. The public disclosure law declares that public confidence in government at all levels is essential. Confidence is built on knowledge. The purpose of this study is not to vilify PACs, nor is it to defend them. Its purpose is to bring to light more knowledge about PACs, their nature and their operations.

PACs are not totally new. Some existed prior to the adoption of the public disclosure law by initiative in 1972 which opened to public view the ways money is raised and spent in election campaigns. The vigorous growth of PACs since that time has altered the campaign financing landscape. PACs are said to be changing the relationships among voters, parties, elected officials, and candidates, and there is much disagreement as to the desirability of these changes. Critics of PACs allege that they corrupt, or at least compromise, the political system. Supporters see them as a positive new force and credit them with going counter to the notion that people are dropping out of the political system.

The term "political action committee" is not defined in the Washington disclosure statute nor does it appear anywhere in the federal election laws. State law (RCW 42.17.020) does define a "political committee" as a person other than an individual dealing with his own funds who receives contributions or makes expenditures to support or oppose any candidate or ballot proposition. ("Person" is defined to include not only individuals but also partnerships, corporations, associations, committees, political parties, or any other organizations or groups.) Under this definition of a political committee, a group organized to raise and spend money to support or oppose a specific ballot issue, whether a state-wide initiative or a local school levy proposition, is indeed a political committee, but not a PAC as that term is generally used.

A working definition of a PAC is needed. For the purposes of this study, a PAC is defined as a political committee registered as such with the state of Washington Public Disclosure Commission and that is not a political party organization, is not organized solely to support or oppose ballot issues, and is not a

committee organized to support a single specific candidate. The commission's filing system divides such committees among three broad categories: union, business, and miscellaneous. The miscellaneous category includes some minor party organizations that are not counted as PACs in this study.

Practically all of Washington's PACs have some parent organization--a labor union, corporation, trade or professional association. Most of the parent organizations also employ lobbyists.

PACs--especially those which operate at the federal level--have been featured on television news documentaries and in such general circulation periodicals as Readers Digest, Time, Newsweek, Psychology Today, and Field and Stream. Much of this reporting has had a negative effect. Roper surveys in 1981 and 1982 found that the American people saw PACs as a "bad thing" by a margin of about two to one. This suggests that whatever knowledge about PACs has so far entered the public consciousness has not been such as to increase public confidence in the electoral process. According to a report in the publication State Legislatures, a Harris survey found 62 percent of the public thinking that excessive campaign spending is a very serious problem. PACs are certainly related in the public mind to high campaign spending.

One of the public policies declared in the disclosure law is that small contributions by individuals are to be encouraged. The commission, therefore, has an interest in finding out whether PACs are encouraging or discouraging small contributors: Do PACs provide an avenue for the small contributor to have an impact by combining his money with that of many others of like mind? Or, does the public perception that candidates rely on interest groups--including PACs--discourage small donors?

This study seeks objective answers to the following questions:

How extensive has been the increase in PAC formation and participation in state campaigns?

Who are the members of the PACs? Why do they give? Are they politically active in other ways? Are they different from those who give directly to candidates?

How do the PACs spend their money? What types of candidates do they support? How are their decisions made as to which candidates to support?

From the viewpoints of candidates and party officials, what is the role of PACs in elections?

With respect to campaign contributions, how have the major political parties fared compared with the PACs?

PAC proliferation at the federal level can be attributed at least in part to election reform legislation that shut off some potential sources of campaign funds. State law, however, does not prohibit government contractors or corporations from making direct contributions to candidates from corporate funds. Labor unions are not restricted in political giving by state law. There are no ceilings on the amounts that individuals, corporations, unions, or any other organizations with or without political action committees may contribute directly to state campaigns. Despite the absence of such restrictions, PACs have proliferated at the state level at a rate that parallels their more-publicized advances at the federal level. From 1977 through 1984 an average of 36 new PACs registered each year in Washington.

Washington's law does require full and timely disclosure of campaign contributions by candidates and campaign committees. Somewhat remote as an incentive for PAC formation might be a desire to remain anonymous to a degree or to dress up the true source of a contribution by making it appear to come from a committee with a high-sounding name rather than from a company, union, or trade association. In California, there was once a "Consumer Action Committee" which turned out to be the lobbyist for professional astrologers and an "Environmental Action Committee" which had sandblasting contractors among its members. California in 1985 joined Montana and Florida in passing "truth-in-PAC-labelling" legislation. The Montana law now requires all PACs with "specific economic interests" to have names that clearly identify the interests of their contributors.

Most PAC names in Washington are straightforward, clearly identifying the sponsoring organization. Since a committee's affiliations and contributors must also be a matter of public record in registration statements and financial reports, there is little to be gained by deliberately deceptive packaging of political contributions. The press and the political community, if not the general public, soon learn the true identity of a name that is less than clear. A deceptive name would seem to defeat the purpose of making the contribution if the candidate is unable to recognize and thus feel properly grateful to the donor.

I. PAC GROWTH

Increased PAC activity in electoral politics in Washington state can be measured in a variety of ways. One would be a simple count of the number of committees registered and functioning. Another would be their financial activity: the amount of dollars that flow through the PACs and into the campaigns of the candidates. Another measure would be a count of people participating as members of the PACs. This section of the report will use all three measures to document the increased PAC activity in recent years.

Number of PACs. The number of PACs operating in the state of Washington has steadily increased. Table 1.1 shows the number of PACs in each of the three types--business, union, and miscellaneous--that were registered and reported some activity during the even-numbered election years from 1976 through 1984. The second section of the table shows the number of PACs that reported expenditures of \$5,000 or more, eliminating a number of minor committees.

Table 1.1 NUMBER OF COMMITTEES REGISTERED AND ACTIVE IN
WASHINGTON STATE, 1976-1984

Committee Type	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984
Business	78	88	113	130	136
Union	49	71	78	73	63
Miscellaneous	<u>3</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>19</u>
TOTALS	130	169	224	228	218
Spending \$5,000 or more:					
Business	42	40	57	66	78
Union	13	14	26	34	32
Miscellaneous	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTALS	55	54	88	106	118

The table shows a steady increase in the number of PACs, from 130 in 1976 to 218 in 1984. The number of active union and miscellaneous PACs declined, however, once a peak was reached in 1980. But when committees spending less than \$5,000 are excluded, the pattern of regular growth exists for all three types of committees, their number more than doubling from 55 in 1976 to 118 in 1984. In this group of committees, the number of active union PACs doubled between 1976 and 1980, then seemed to level off.

The composition of the PAC lineup is constantly changing. The increase in the number of business PACs from 78 to 88 between 1976 and 1978 does not represent a simple addition of ten new committees. Rather, there were 35 new business PACs formed and 25 of those active in 1976 had gone out of existence by 1978, leaving a net gain of ten business committees. In all, 45 of the 78 business PACs existing in 1976 were no longer reporting by 1984. The 33 remaining from the 1976 elections had been joined by 103 new business PACs registered more recently than 1976.(1) Table 1.2 shows the number of committees entering and leaving the field every biennium.

Table 1.2 BIENNIAL CHANGES IN NUMBER OF COMMITTEES, 1978-1984

Committee Type	1977-78	1979-80	1981-82	1983-84
Business	78	88	113	130
New	35	40	38	41
Terminated	-25	-15	-21	-35
Net	10	25	17	6
Union	49	71	78	73
New	38	22	16	9
Terminated	-16	-15	-21	-19
Net	22	7	-5	-10
Miscellaneous	3	10	33	25
New	8	27	9	6
Terminated	-1	-4	-17	-12
Net	7	23	-8	-6

The number of new business PACs has been fairly constant, ranging between 35 and 41 every two years. New union PACs, however, have steadily declined--only 9 new ones in 1983-84 compared with 38 in 1977-78. In 1982 and 1984 the number of new union committees was actually exceeded by the number of terminated union committees, resulting in a net decline. A large number of the terminated committees were affiliated with local teacher associations, and the political finance activity did not actually end but was transferred to regional councils.

The number of PACs in the miscellaneous category has fluctuated even more than the business and union PACs. This category includes the committees that are often described in the literature about federal-level PACs as "ideological" PACs. Many of them have no parent organization of continuing existence as do the unions and business committees. Some of them have specific

areas of concern, such as abortion, energy, the environment, or women's affairs. Others are political action funds for minority groups such as Asian Americans, blacks, and gays. A record number of 27 new PACs of this category came into existence in 1980 and 16 of them were gone by 1982.

Dollar amounts. Total spending by PACs increased from the amount of \$1.86 million in 1976 to \$5.20 million in 1984. Not all of this spending was in the nature of campaign contributions, nor did all of the contributions go to legislative candidates, but the eight-year increase is comparable to the increase in spending by legislative candidates, which went from \$2.07 million in 1976 to \$6.03 million in 1984.

Table 1.3 PAC EXPENDITURES IN WASHINGTON STATE,
ELECTION YEARS 1976-1984

Committee Type	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984
Business	1,257,029	1,030,992	2,210,455	2,237,836	3,247,972
Union	602,473	739,268	1,297,867	1,672,145	1,840,605
Miscellaneous	4,013	14,655	81,553	88,547	110,461
All PACS	1,863,515	1,784,915	3,589,875	3,998,528	5,199,038

The increased PAC activity in Washington state parallels increases reported at the federal level. Frank Sorauf reports that there were 1,146 PACs registered with the Federal Election Commission in 1976 and 3,371 by 1982.(2) Reported PAC contributions to U.S. congressional candidates went from \$22.6 million in 1976 to \$83.1 million in 1982. In the latter year, 31 percent of the campaign money received by candidates for the U.S. House of Representatives came from PACs. This compares with figures from a previous PDC study of campaign sources which found that PAC contributions accounted for 31 percent of the money raised by a sample of legislative candidates in 1974, 39 percent in 1978, and 37 percent in 1982.(3)

The growing importance of PAC money is shown by the fact that PAC contributions of \$250 or more accounted for 24 percent of the money raised by state legislative candidates in 1978, 27 percent in 1980 and 1982, and rose to 29 percent in 1984. In some of the closest state races, half or more of the money spent has come from PACs, as in the 44th district house race in 1984 where PACs provided \$36,625 of the \$71,416 spent by Paul King and Janet Nelson.

PACs put more than \$50,000 into a single race in 1984--the 20th district senate election, where Republican Stuart Halsan defeated incumbent Republican Senator Bill Fuller by 47 votes. Halsan's contributions from 19 different PACs amounted to a total of \$27,720, the largest of which was \$8,502 from the Washington Federation of State Employees. From 21 PACs, Fuller received \$26,325, led by United for Washington's \$16,500. This race also illustrates another practice of some PACs: there were five PACs that gave to both Fuller and Halsan (Council for Economic Progress, First Associates, Public Employees Action Committee, SAVPAC, and the Washington State Dental PAC).

The size of PAC contributions to individual candidates is escalating. The largest recorded contribution by a PAC to one candidate in 1974 was \$3,500. The largest PAC contribution in a 1980 senate race was \$11,101 given to Dick Hemstad by United for Washington. That was topped in 1984 by the \$16,500 that United for Washington gave to Fuller. In the 1980 senate races there were eight PAC contributions greater than \$5,000, all but one of them from United for Washington. In the 1984 senate races, United for Washington made eight contributions in the over-\$5000 range, the Washington Federation of State Employees made six, and the Right to Bear Arms Political Victory Fund made one.

As part of her 1979 analysis of campaign finance, Lucy Gaskill(4) compiled figures on the contributions to legislative candidates in Washington state made by several organizations which she identified as "interest groups." Those groups which are PACs as defined in this study and which made contributions in 1984 as well as in 1978 are listed in Table 1.4. The total legislative contributions and average (mean) contribution amount for each PAC are shown for the 1978 and 1984 elections. In six years the total amount contributed by these ten committees doubled (\$547,981 in 1978, \$1,153,334 in 1984) and the size of the average contribution also doubled from \$592 in 1978 to \$1,237 in 1984.

TABLE 1.4. CONTRIBUTIONS TO GENERAL ELECTION LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES
BY SELECTED LARGE PACS, 1978 AND 1984

COMMITTEE	No. of candidates supported		Total contributed		Average Amount	
	1978	1984	1978	1984	1978	1984
United for Washington	88	52	\$169,123	\$380,546	\$1,922	\$7,318
Wa St Labor Council PPP	88	101	84,226	85,536	957	847
PULSE (Wa Education Assn)	98	83	71,154	78,800	726	949
Wa St Dental PAC	103	102	47,370	55,425	459	543
Wa Federation of State Employees	80	95	41,052	211,687	513	2,228
Fair Competition Council	95	94	37,649	64,150	396	682
Realtors' PAC	116	102	31,820	105,300	274	1,032
First Associates	102	110	28,169	53,775	276	489
Washington Medical PAC	65	102	20,318	99,080	312	971
BUILD/BUILD East	90	91	17,100	19,035	190	209
TOTALS			547,981	1,153,334	592	1,237

TABLE 1.5 MEMBER/CONTRIBUTORS REPORTED BY SELECTED LARGE PACS, 1978 AND 1984

COMMITTEE	Number of Members		Mean Member Dues or Contribution Amount	
	1978	1984	1978	1984
Realtors' PAC	1650 firms & individuals	3991 firms & individuals	\$30.16	\$41.87
United for Washington	737 groups & individuals	811 groups & individuals	\$244.08	\$474.18
Wa Affordable Housing Council (Builders' PAC)	110 firms & individuals	132 firms & individuals	\$136.52	\$116.59
Fair Competition Council	4 firms	4 firms	\$7,000.00	\$9,000.00
PULSE (Wa Education Assn)	24,644	29,443	\$10.00	\$13.00
Wa Federation of State Employees	13,416	16,921	\$3.60	\$13.20
Wa St Dental PAC	926	1,188	\$35.27	\$41.80
First Associates	681	490	\$65.28	\$128.36
Washington Medical PAC	523	1453	\$40.72	\$63.31

Summary. It is evident that there have been some changes in the ways political campaigns are funded in the years since the public disclosure law first began to shed light on the subject. There has been a constant increase in the number of political action committees, with more and more members giving larger and larger amounts to the committees. The PACs give more and more dollars to the candidates. By whatever measure is applied, the role of PACs is many times greater than it was eight or ten years ago.

I. FOOTNOTES

(1) In computing these figures, every effort was made to identify committees that were not truly new, but were a result of name changes or institutional mergers.

(2) Frank J. Sorauf, "Political Action Committees in American Politics: An Overview," in What Price PACs?, 1984.

(3) Public Disclosure Commission, "Analysis of Campaign Contribution Sources, Washington State Legislative Campaigns, 1974-1978-1982," 1984.

(4) Lucy Gaskill, "Campaign Finance: An Analysis of Interest Group Behavior in Washington State," 1979.

II. PAC MEMBERS: WHO ARE THEY?

The growth and proliferation of PACs have raised questions about their members: the individuals whose dollars make it possible for the PACs to multiply the amounts they put into political campaigns. In short, who are these people? Are they different from the general public? Are they somehow different from other political contributors--those who give to candidates or to the parties? What are their motives for joining?

Of particular significance in terms of Washington's public disclosure law with its purpose of encouraging small contributions are such questions as these: Are the PACs opening new opportunities for participation and bringing more people into the population of political contributors? Or do the PACs simply provide another channel for those who were already so inclined? Are contributors using the PACs to substitute for other modes of making political contributions?

Those who provided the "mother's milk" of politics in the conventional ways by giving to political parties or to candidates have been the subjects of various studies in the past. The general findings were that they constituted a small and somewhat elite minority of the voting population of the country. Ruth Jones and Warren Miller point out that over a period of several years--from the middle 1950's to the early 1970's--it was a constant 10 percent of the eligible electorate who made financial contributions to political parties or candidates.(1) However, by 1980 the poll which is regularly conducted by the Center for Political Studies at the University of Michigan indicated that possibly as many as two-fifths of the electorate could be counted as political contributors. Accounting for the rapid increase was the federal income tax checkoff option, which first appeared in 1976, allowing taxpayers to designate that a dollar from their income tax be credited to the presidential election campaign fund, and which was used by 31 percent of the adult citizenry in 1980.(2)

In the 1980 survey, 7 percent reported giving money to candidates, 4 percent to political parties, and 7 percent to "political action groups." In the 1982 survey, the number giving to political action groups had risen to 8.5 percent of the sample. The wording of this question was such as to encourage affirmative answers also from those who were not PAC members, strictly speaking, but belonged to national associations or lobbying groups. For this and other reasons, Frank Sorauf believes the 8.5 percent figure is too high and should be reduced by one-third, leaving the estimate of PAC members at about 6 percent of the electorate.(3)

Miller and Jones compared the PAC givers of 1980 with party contributors and candidate contributors. Median incomes of PAC givers were lower than those of party givers and candidate givers. Median ages of the PAC givers were also lower. They also found that the PAC contributors were the least likely of the three groups to be engaged in any of the traditional campaign activities--wearing buttons, doing party work, attending rallies or fund raisers, or even voting. Sorauf made the same comparisons of those responding to the same survey two years later and he concluded that PAC donors tend to be "among the least active and involved" of American political activists.

These estimates and descriptions of PAC donors are based on nationwide surveys. They include contributors to any political action group, not just state level committees. For an insight into the nature of a more limited group--those who are current members of political action committees involved in the elections of Washington state--we turn to a poll conducted in this state.

Like candidates and all other types of political committees in Washington, PACs are required to file monthly reports disclosing the names and addresses of all persons contributing an amount of \$25 or more. A sample was drawn from these lists in June 1985 by taking for each committee its most recent monthly report that listed contributors. Names were then drawn at random from those lists. Each respondent received a cover letter explaining the research, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to return the survey. The letter assured the confidentiality of the respondents. The three-page questionnaire asked for some personal background information, and had questions about political participation, reasons for joining a PAC, length of PAC membership, solicitation methods used, and size of contribution.

The size and diversity of the original sample together with the excellent return make it possible to be fairly confident of the usefulness of the data. Of 1,030 questionnaires mailed out, 547 were completed and returned in less than a month, giving a 55 percent response rate without a follow-up reminder.

Some of the items on the questionnaire, particularly those dealing with personal data and political interests, were taken directly from the survey instrument used by Anne Hopkins and Ruth Jones in their 1983 survey of contributors to state elections in Arizona and Tennessee.(5) This makes it possible to make some comparisons among different sets of contributors in different states. Some other items from the Hopkins-Jones survey were modified on the Washington PAC questionnaire.

Profile of Contributors. In terms of the standard socioeconomic descriptors of income, occupation, and education, the population of PAC contributors in Washington state is substantially higher in status than the state's general population. Those personal attributes are listed below:

<u>Occupation</u>		<u>Income</u>	
Bankers/financial	26%	Under \$30,000	12%
Managers/executives	14%	\$30,000-\$50,000	31%
Physicians/medical	12%	\$50,001-70,000	31%
Educators	11%	\$70,001-90,000	11%
Engineers	5%	Over \$90,000	15%
Other professionals	5%		
Retired	4%	<u>Education</u>	
Lawyer	3%		
Sales	3%	High school or less	7%
Insurance	2%	Some college	18%
Owners/other business	2%	College graduate	30%
Farmer/rancher	1%	Graduate school	23%
Public officials/employees	1%	Professional school	21%
Realtor	1%		
Clerical/skilled	1%		
Contractor	1%		
Homemaker	1%		
Other	6%		

While the average family income in Washington in 1984 was a little over \$21,000, the average was in the neighborhood of \$50,000 for this group of contributors. The percentages of them in high status jobs, such as doctors, lawyers, and bankers, are all higher than in the general population. The same holds true for level of education: while 15 percent of Washingtonians hold a college degree, 74 percent of the sample have received at least their bachelor degrees. Thus, the profile parallels the common description of political elite--wealthy, well-educated, and in high status occupations.

It should be noted that while union-related PACs spent about \$56 in 1984 for every \$100 spent by business-related PACs, only 6 percent of the persons receiving PAC survey questionnaires were selected because of membership in a union PAC.(6) There are two reasons for this apparent under-representation of union members in the sample. One is that much of the money spent by some of the business PACs comes from businesses and partnerships, but the survey was sent only to individuals. Another reason is that names of contributors of less than \$25 in a year need not be

filed with the commission; where a union's PAC dues or allocations are less than that amount there are no names on the public record from which to draw a sample. Arrangements were made with officers of PULSE--the teacher organization's state-wide committee and one of the largest PACs in the state--to include a sample of their members in the study, although the yearly dues were only \$13 at that time.

The Washington state PAC contributors are a more affluent group than the 1980 nationwide sample of PAC contributors analyzed by Jones and Miller. In that group, 56 percent had incomes in the \$15,000-\$35,000 range, with 20 percent below \$15,000 and 25 percent over \$35,000.(7) The estimated median income would be close to \$26,000 compared with \$50,000 for the Washington group.

Washington PAC contributors have much more in common with the contributors to state-level campaigns in Arizona and Tennessee. Hopkins and Jones describe the latter group as a "decidedly socio-economic elite when compared to their fellow citizens." (8) Median family income for the Arizona-Tennessee contributors was not much greater than \$50,000. About 70 percent of the Arizona-Tennessee and more than 80 percent of the Washington PAC members were professional and business people. Educationally, the contributors in both studies are very much alike with college degrees earned by 70 percent of the Arizona-Tennessee group and 74 percent of the Washington PAC contributors.

Voting and political preferences. Not surprisingly, voter registration and voting figures were high for those included in the sample. More than 97 percent are registered voters, 90 percent said they voted in the 1984 primary, and 98.5 percent of those registered voted in the 1984 general election. Republicans far outnumbered Democrats in the group. PAC contributors identified their political leanings as follows:

Republican	45%
Independent but close to Republican	17%
Independent	9%
Independent but close to Democratic	10%
Democratic	18%

Very few of the PAC members would place themselves at either extreme of the liberal-conservative ideological spectrum, but the majority are at least somewhat conservative. The question was:

"We hear a lot of talk these days about liberals and conservatives. Where on this seven-point scale would you place yourself?"

Responses:

1	Extremely liberal	2%
2		5%
3		14%
4		20%
5		41%
6		13%
7	Extremely conservative	2%

Political activity. The PAC members were given a list of twelve activities and asked to check off those that they had done at any time before becoming PAC members or contributors. Activities listed covered campaign contributions, political party participation, volunteer campaign work, and contacting elected officials on issues. The list was repeated and they were instructed to check those activities that they had done since becoming PAC members.

<u>Action reported by PAC members</u>	<u>BEFORE joining a PAC</u>	<u>SINCE joining a PAC</u>	<u>EITHER Before or Since</u>
Followed campaigns in newspaper, TV or radio	73%	73%	78%
Written to a legislator or other elected official expressing feelings on issues	59%	65%	72%
Contributed money directly to a candidate	52%	54%	62%
Spoken to a legislator or other elected official expressing feelings on issues	44%	49%	56%
Publicized a candidate, party or issue (sign, bumper sticker, button)	41%	39%	49%
Contributed money to a political party	34%	31%	40%

<u>Action reported by PAC members</u> (Continued)	<u>BEFORE joining a PAC</u>	<u>SINCE joining a PAC</u>	<u>EITHER Before or Since</u>
Attended political fund-raising events	30%	35%	40%
Actively worked in a political campaign	30%	28%	39%
Did volunteer work on a ballot issue campaign (levy, initiative, bond issue)	26%	26%	34%
Contributed money to a ballot issue campaign	26%	25%	32%
Attended party convention or caucus as a delegate or alternate	15%	13%	19%
Held office in a political party organization or party club	9%	8%	12%

Aside from the rather passive "activity" of following campaigns in the news, there were three items that were checked by a majority of the respondents. One was making a campaign contribution directly to a candidate (62%), and the other two had to do with contacting legislators or other officials regarding issues (in writing, 72%; by speaking, 56%). These two, along with attending political fund-raisers, were the only of the behaviors that increased sufficiently after joining a PAC to be regarded as statistically significant increases, not attributable to sampling error. Their high ranking on the list of activities indicates that PAC members, as a group, are both vitally and vocally interested in specific issues. The increases in contacting officials also suggest that membership in a political organization stimulates such communication. Many PACs or their parent organizations encourage their members at very specific and strategic times to contact their legislators and let their views be known on an issue of interest to the organization.

One PAC member who had never met an elected official face-to-face before joining the PAC described how the PAC had made such encounters possible:

"We have 'brown bag' lunch forums at our workplace where candidates are allowed to debate and display their platforms...and then 30 minutes of open questions, answers, and

<u>Actions reported by PAC members, divided by longevity of membership</u> (Continued)	<u>Joined before 1982</u>	<u>Joined after 1981</u>
Contributed money directly to a candidate	66%	59%
Spoken to a legislator or other elected official expressing feelings on issues	59%	53%
Publicized a candidate, party or issue (sign, bumper sticker, button)	57%	40%
Contributed money to a political party	42%	37%
Attended political fund-raising events	44%	36%
Actively worked in a political campaign	42%	34%
Did volunteer work on a ballot issue campaign (levy, initiative, bond issue)	37%	30%
Contributed money to a ballot issue campaign	33%	32%
Attended party convention or caucus as a delegate or alternate	22%	16%
Held office in a political party organization or party club	17%	8%

There is not sufficient evidence, however, to support a conclusion that the newer members are less politically active than those with more experience as PAC members. The survey had no question about age, but it is likely that the newer members are also younger: some of the pre-1982 members reported that they had started in 1970 or earlier. The newer members are just more recent entrants in the world of political action and many have had less time to get involved in campaigns and parties.

Reasons for PAC membership. Respondents were also presented a list of twelve possible reasons for giving to a PAC and were asked to check all of the reasons that applied to them. Economic interest--protecting or advancing the interests of one's own business or profession--was the leading reason, selected by 71 percent of the sample. About half chose reasons that might be interpreted as having a bit of altruism in them: because "good citizens should pay for good government" or "to advance causes that I believe in." Only one in ten chose PAC giving in order to avoid being publicly associated with candidate campaigns. To 41 percent, the PAC offers a means of participating financially in elections that is preferable to giving through political parties.

<u>Reasons for making a contribution to a PAC</u>	<u>Checked by:</u>
I see it as a way to protect or advance the interests of my profession or business.	71%
I liked what I heard about the committee's goals.	61%
It is a way to advance causes that I believe in.	50%
I believe good citizens should pay for good government.	48%
My committee supports good candidates that I might not ever know about.	45%
I would rather give to a candidate or PAC than to a political party.	41%
A payroll deduction makes it convenient to give.	35%
I was asked to give by a person I know.	32%
I liked what I learned about the committee's record.	30%
It was an expected part of my job.	21%
For business or other reasons, I don't wish my name to appear on lists of candidate supporters, and the committee gives me an opportunity to contribute in a legitimate way without being listed.	10%
Political contributions helped in making business and social contacts.	2%

Some survey respondents chose to clarify their reasons for PAC membership or to add reasons not included on the checklist. For example, a physician wrote: "The political forces pressuring the profession are intense. Not to respond to them is naive," and added: "The contribution has heightened my political awareness."

Other comments included:

"United we stand; divided we fall! Legislators respect their perception of power. If special interests are to be represented (e.g., 'unions', etc.), then I want representation, too." (Engineer)

"Politics are a fact of life and, if you want to protect the public's and your interests, you must be involved. Just being right doesn't always win!" (Medical doctor)

"Due to my work, I have traveled to many countries. I firmly believe that I am very lucky to be a USA citizen. I don't believe 'freedom' means a free ride so I try to do what I can to pay my way. It's worth it!" (Sales and marketing)

Of that 29 percent of the sample who did not check protecting or advancing business or professional interests as one of their reasons for giving, the leading motive was liking the committee's goals (58 percent). A majority of them also chose what were termed in the paragraph above as the somewhat altruistic motives, 52 percent to advance causes, 50 percent to pay for good government.

In all, 114 respondents, or 21 percent of the total, gave as at least one of their reasons for PAC membership the fact that it was an expected part of their jobs. The largest occupational group to give this reason were bankers (46), followed by 15 who gave "manager" as their occupation, 7 educators, 6 accountants, and 40 scattered among a number of occupations. This group of perhaps reluctant contributors is much less active politically in all ways than the other PAC members. Only one-third of them have given money to a party organization, compared with 51 percent in the rest of the sample, and 47 percent have given to candidates, compared with 78 percent for the others. In attending party conventions, holding party office, and working on candidate or ballot measure campaigns, they are less involved than the rest of the PAC members.

Even less active are the PAC members who said they give money through PACs in order to avoid having their names being publicized as candidate supporters. Their desire for anonymity extends to working on campaigns, which only 22 percent have done, compared with 43 percent of the other PAC members.

The 35 percent of the sample who signed up for PAC membership because payroll deductions made it convenient to give constitute a sizeable portion of the group. The number suggests an analogy of the PAC as a political United Way, a one-stop approach to spreading donations around. Sorauf points out that, like the United Way, the PAC saves the giver from making difficult choices while producing some side benefits to the giver--among them the approval or favor of one's superiors, a sense of contributing to professional or workplace solidarity, and the enhancement of one's image.(9)

A few respondents commented on the involuntary nature of some PAC memberships. A teacher crossed out the word "convenient" in the statement that read: "A payroll deduction makes it convenient to give" and substituted the words "almost mandatory." The teacher claimed to believe in the PAC but was concerned about the inconvenience of exercising the option of stopping the automatic payroll deductions for the PAC. A banker whose only reason for giving to a PAC was that it was an expected part of the job commented: "I am not sure that the goals of the PAC are appropriate. Over a period of years, I have observed giving funds to opposing opponents, sometimes equal amounts. I have been led to believe that the political reality is that it has an entropic effect on the candidate. That is to say, if you contribute to the candidate then you might have an improved opportunity to be heard. This has a taint to it in my view."

Some of the reason statements on the questionnaire were taken directly from the instrument used by Jones and Hopkins in their survey of contributors to candidates in the states of Tennessee and Arizona. Since the Washington PAC contributors have turned out to be quite similar to the Arizona-Tennessee candidate contributors in other ways, a comparison of their motives for giving might be extended to form some conclusions about the similarities or differences between PAC contributors and candidate contributors in general.

There were four statements common to both questionnaires and the responses of Washington PAC contributors in each case were quite different from the responses of contributors to gubernatorial and state legislative candidates in Arizona and Tennessee. The statements and the percentages of each group checking them as reasons for contributing:

	Wash. PAC	Ariz. Gov. & Leg.	Tenn. & Leg.
I believe good citizens should pay for good government.	48%	77%	79%
I was asked to give by a person I know.	32%	51%	52%
It was an expected part of my job.	21%	8%	7%
Political contributions helped in making business and social contacts.	2%	11%	18%

Based on these returns, PAC contributors appear to be more pragmatic contributors than candidate contributors. The candidate contributors show more concern with the civic responsibility aspect of campaign financing than do the PAC members. Pressure

at work is more frequently a reason for going along with a PAC than it is for giving to a candidate. In-person contacts are more responsible for candidate contributions than they are for PAC contributions. The prospect of making business and social contacts is sometimes a consideration in making a candidate contribution but almost never is a reason for joining a PAC.

Summary. For their members, Washington's political action committees have not gone very far outside the well-educated occupational and economic elite that for many years has constituted the bulk of contributors in national politics. It is an activist, issue-oriented elite, however. The members' most common motive is to benefit their own businesses and professions. Pursuit of this political goal takes them beyond the act of signing up as PAC members and into a variety of other activities--from working on campaigns and attending fund-raisers to writing letters to their legislators. They have a more pragmatic approach to making political contributions than those who give to candidates.

II. FOOTNOTES

(1) Ruth S. Jones and Warren E. Miller, "Financing Campaigns: Macro Level Innovation and Micro Level Response," Arizona State University (July 1983): 11.

(2) Ibid., 13.

(3) Frank J. Sorauf, "Who's in Charge? Accountability in Political Action Committees," Political Science Quarterly 99:4 (Winter 1984-85): 596.

(4) Ibid., 611.

(5) Anne H. Hopkins and Ruth S. Jones, "Individual Contributors to State Elections: Arizona and Tennessee," Prepared for delivery at the 1983 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

(6) Another 6 percent went to persons who were members of PACs that were neither union- nor business-related.

(7) Jones and Miller, 44.

(8) Hopkins and Jones, 6.

(9) Sorauf, 598.

III. GETTING AND SPENDING PAC DOLLARS

With just a little examination, it soon becomes apparent that it is almost impossible to generalize about PACs. There are too many differences among them in their goals, methods and procedures--including the ways of raising money and how and when they use their members' dollars. Most PACs raise money by selling memberships or soliciting donations, using the same methods that candidates and parties and charities use: personal persuasion, telephone banks, direct mail, rallies, fund-raising dinners, and sales of items like T-shirts. One of Washington's PACs raised part of its money in 1984 by selling a new house. Many get money only from individuals. But some PACs take contributions from companies as well as individuals. One of Washington's larger PACs, the Fair Competition Council, has no individual members or contributors, only four energy companies. The Affordable Housing Council--the same homebuilders' PAC which netted \$21,892 from selling a house at \$71,450--had contributions averaging about \$200 each from about 260 individuals and firms, but it also had a contribution of \$25,000 from a single firm and \$15,000 from another.

Some PACs even get money from other PACs.

How the money is used also varies from PAC to PAC. Some organizations use part of the PAC funds to pay the salaries and expenses of their lobbyists--full-time year-round employees. Some PACs spend money on polls or surveys during elections. A few PACs give to legislative candidates only. Some give to the political parties and others don't. Some give to nonpartisan judicial candidates and others don't. There are some committees that balance their contributions fairly evenly between Democratic and Republican candidates and there are others that give almost exclusively to members of one party or the other.

Since there is so much diversity among the PACs, it becomes necessary to examine them individually. For this portion of the study of PACs in Washington state in 1984, 20 committees were selected for detailed analysis of their contribution and expenditure reports. The 20 committees were simply those who reported the highest total expenditures for the year, an amount which ranged from a high of \$593,536 to \$37,778 for the twentieth PAC on the list. From the disclosure reports, two kinds of information were tabulated: (1) their contributions received and other income, and (2) their campaign contributions and other kinds of expenditures. The committees, their affiliations or parent organizations, and their 1984 total reported expenditures are listed:

TABLE 3.1. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 EXPENDITURES

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES 1984
United for Washington	Washington state businesses	\$593,536
PULSE	Washington Education Assn	555,694
Wa Federation of State Employees	State employees union	440,575
Realtors PAC WA	Wa Assn of Realtors	259,429
Council for Economic Progress	Restaurant Assn of Wa	221,861
Public Employees Action Committee	Public School Employees of WA	211,212
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	Wa St Labor Council	191,363
Wa Medical PAC	Wa St Medical Assn	147,166
First Associates	Officers of Seafirst Corp.	122,678
LAWPAC	Wa St Trial Lawyers Assn	113,793
Affordable Housing Council	Seattle Master Builders	111,035
Committee of Repdems	Wa Assn of Automobile Dealers	101,009
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	Savings & Loan industry	78,456
Wa St Dental PAC	Wa St Dental Assn	77,732
Fair Competition Council	Private electric utilities	69,361
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	Plumbers & Pipefitters union	62,387
Care PAC	Nursing home industry	45,471
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	Convalescent centers	43,378
Bar PAC	Wa St Bar Assn	41,220
Wa Affordable Housing Council	Home Builders Assn. of Wa	37,778
		\$3,525,134

Because the 20 committees were selected on the basis of their total expenditures rather than the amount of their campaign contributions, the group includes some who may have contributed less to candidates than one or more of the committees not included in this group. Total spending by the 15 business PACs and 5 union-related PACs included in the group was \$3,525,134, which is 69 percent of the total amount spent by all business and union PACs during the year. Among the business PACs are five from the health care field, two from banking, and two from the legal profession. Thirteen of the 20 have disclosure histories dating back to 1976 or earlier. The \$1.54 million that these 20 PACs put into legislative campaigns accounted for more than one fourth of the total of more than \$6 million spent by the candidates in those campaigns. Their money went into every legislative district in every part of the state.

In Appendix B is a list of the top 20 PACs of 1984 which summarizes their sources of funds, their legislative campaign contributions, other political contributions, and some of their other major expenditures. The sums of amounts listed as expenditures will not agree with the 1984 totals in Table 3.1 because only the major non-contribution expenditures are listed in the summary. Included in the legislative contribution totals are candidate donations made prior to 1984 for the 1984 campaigns; contributions and expenditures are for the 1984 calendar year.

Most of the committees reported ordinary operating overhead costs--such as clerical salaries, office space, and postage--in some way. Sometimes these costs were reported as in-kind contributions from the PAC's parent organization; in other cases, they were reported as transactions where the PAC treasury reimbursed its parent organization. One committee, Washington Health Facilities Association PAC, reported absolutely no expenditures during 1984 other than its political contributions.

In the case of the Washington Federation of State Employees, the per capita allocation reported to the PDC represents a combined lobbying and political action program. Other committees on the list reporting lobbying expenditures include the Council for Economic Progress, Public Employees Action Committee, and the plumbers' and pipefitters' union. To compare these four committees with the others as to their total expenditures for influencing elections and public policy, it would be necessary to go to the lobbying expenditure reports filed by the parent organizations of the other PACs under provisions of the public disclosure law separate from the campaign finance provisions.

The kinds of political contributions made by these 20 leading PACs are presented in Table 3.2 below. United for Washington is the only committee that gave only to legislative candidates. All of the others made at least some contribution to at least one candidate for executive office.

TABLE 3.2. CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY TOP 20 PACS IN 1984

Committee Name	To Candidates:				To Committees:		
	Legis.	Exec.	Judic.	Local Office	Party	Caucus	Other PACs
Affordable Housing Council	\$42,099	\$18,750	\$12,000	\$300	0	\$770	\$19,830
Bar PAC	33,225	250	0	0	0	3,530	0
Care PAC	26,950	9,025	0	0	2,500	3,550	0
Committee of Repdems	9,950	2,528	0	0	0	150	0
Council for Economic Progress	26,450	21,331	0	810	445	2,605	200
Fair Competition Council	65,450	650	0	315	0	1,950	0
First Associates	54,375	46,885	0	1,300	9,400	900	9,580
LAWPAC	70,999	28,650	0	0	1,500	3,015	0
Public Employees Action Committee	50,875	26,328	0	250	2,398	9,900	0
PULSE	90,300	130,514	2,500		750	2,720	4,600
Realtors PAC WA	108,800	37,100	3,000	27,224	1,100	0	
Savings Assn Volunt. PAC	53,400	10,975	0	0	350	11,480	375
United for Washington	380,546	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wa St Assn of the U.A. Code & Leg. Committee	12,860	15,656	0	0	0	580	0
Wa St Dental PAC	56,925	6,000	0	0	0	3,255	0
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	27,200	12,200	0	0	420	3,480	0
Wa St Labor Council PPP	88,036	65,675	20,500	300	10,637	2,780	2,100
Wa Affordable Housing Council	26,125	300	0	1,500	125	825	0
Wa Federation of State Employees	215,787	74,041	2,630	200	1,050	2,183	0
Wa Medical PAC	103,680	19,766	0	0	125	13,970	2,000

For eight of the PACs the amount given to legislative caucus campaign committees are all in the neighborhood of \$3,000 for the year, suggesting the possibility that these PACs contributed in a similar pattern by giving the amounts suggested in the periodic caucus solicitations. Washington Medical PAC and SAVPAC surpassed the others in contributing to the caucuses: the latter committee gave \$1,000 each to the four caucus committees on August 1 and another \$1,000 to each in September after the primary election.

Only five of the 20 committees became involved in the election of judges. These PACs represented organized labor, teachers and public employees, builders and realtors, but not the bar association nor the trial lawyers.

The Repdems, a long-standing committee representing automobile dealers, used practically all its funds in 1984 to promote Initiative 464, a measure on the November ballot to deduct the value of trade-ins from the selling price when computing sales taxes. It contributed to only a few candidates in 1984.

United for Washington, the largest of the PACs, received money from some of the smaller PACs. The largest such contribution was \$8,180 from First Associates.

Legislative Contributions.

Although nearly all of Washington state's PACs get involved in state and local campaigns besides those of candidates for the legislature, they are primarily interested in the legislative elections. In 1984, a year of very costly campaigns for major state-wide offices, 70 percent of the campaign contribution dollars of the top 20 PACs went into the legislative campaigns. In off years the proportion would be even higher. Since most of the attention of the PACs and most of the interest about them and their activities is focused on the legislature, a clarifying look at the nature of their contributions is in order at this point. What types of candidates do they support and how do they decide which candidates to support?

In an attempt to learn more about how decisions are made, 55 officers of PACs were interviewed during the summer and fall of 1985 in a telephone survey conducted by volunteers under supervision of the commission staff. One question in that survey asked the officers to rate the relative importance of eight different factors in deciding whether to support a candidate or how much support to give. Another question asked for the extent that various kinds of persons were involved in making the PAC's political decisions.

Personal characteristics--the candidate's intelligence and effectiveness as a politician--were rated at the top of the list of factors used in making support decisions. Contrary to popular impression, party affiliation and incumbency were the factors rated least important. According to those surveyed, PAC officers have the greatest degree of involvement in making decisions, followed by lobbyists and contributors. The questions and a tabulation of responses follow:

Interviewer reads:

"I would like to get the importance level of several factors used when deciding whether to support a candidate or for how much to support him or her.

"I will read the factor and I would like you to rate that factor using an importance thermometer. Ratings between 50 degrees and 100 degrees mean that they are important to very important in making the decision. Ratings between 0 degrees and 50 degrees mean that they are not important in making the decision.

"The first factor is Party Affiliation. How would you rate this using the thermometer?"

	Average rating	% rating at 50-100 (Important)
party affiliation	38	31%
candidate need	49	62%
incumbency	40	51%
location of district	45	59%
competitiveness of race	65	87%
loyalty to donors	57	74%
effectiveness as politician	77	96%
intelligence	73	92%

Interviewer:

"When deciding which candidates get your financial support, what level of involvement do the following have:"

	A Great Deal	Somewhat	A Little	Not At All	No Response
contributors	25% (14)	33% (18)	22% (12)	13% (7)	7% (4)
officers of sponsor company or affiliate	25% (14)	24% (13)	18% (10)	24% (13)	9% (5)
lobbyists	35% (19)	25% (14)	16% (9)	13% (7)	11% (6)
party people	15% (8)	20% (11)	22% (12)	35% (19)	9% (5)
PAC officers	55% (30)	20% (11)	11% (6)	5% (3)	9% (5)

In selecting candidates to support, effectiveness of the candidate as a politician is the single most important consideration in the view of the PAC officers surveyed, with 96 percent rating it as an important factor (50 or higher on the scale). Since effectiveness is followed closely by intelligence then by competitiveness of the race and loyalty to donors, it would appear that the largest amounts of PAC dollars go to smart and electable candidates in close races--provided they are sufficiently loyal to their backers. PACs are not very likely to waste their money on a dull, ineffective candidate in a hopeless race. On the other hand, since PAC officers tell us that party affiliation and incumbency are the least important of the factors listed, the PACs appear to be willing to oppose an incumbent where there is an opportunity to defeat the incumbent with a bright and effective candidate.

When the responses to the involvement query are weighted--3 points for each "a great deal," 2 points for "somewhat," and 1 for "a little,"--the PAC officers come out with the highest score, 118. In order of involvement in decision-making they are followed by lobbyists, 94; contributors, 90; officers of sponsoring organization, 78; and party people, 58. All but 20 percent of the PAC officers say that contributors are involved to some degree in deciding which candidates to support, and 25 percent say that the contributors have a great deal of involvement. Party people are said to have at least a little input in a majority of cases.

When it comes to choosing candidates to support, the factor of incumbency has greater importance when lobbyists are involved in making the PAC's decisions. In those cases where respondents said lobbyists were "not at all" involved, incumbency had a score of only 11 on the importance thermometer, with no rating higher than 35 degrees. When lobbyists were said to be involved "a great deal," incumbency rose to 54 on the scale, with 14 of 18 assigning it a value of 50 or higher.

Distribution of PAC Money

When the top 20 PACs are ranked solely on the basis of their contributions to legislative candidates, United for Washington, giving exclusively to legislative campaigns, remains as the top spender, followed by state employees, realtors, doctors, and teachers in the top five.

TABLE 3.3. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 CONTRIBUTIONS TO LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES

COMMITTEE	Number Supported	Total Dollars
United for Washington	54	\$380,546
Wa Federation of State Employees	99	215,787
Realtors PAC WA	104	108,800
Wa Medical PAC	108	103,680
PULSE	88	90,300
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	106	88,036
LAWPAC	105	70,999
Fair Competition Council	98	65,450
Wa St Dental PAC	105	56,925
First Associates	112	54,375
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	127	53,400
Public Employees Action Committee	136	50,875
Affordable Housing Council	51	42,099
Bar PAC	59	33,225
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	114	27,200
Care PAC	59	26,950
Council for Economic Progress	131	26,450
Wa Affordable Housing Council	66	26,125
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	75	12,860
Committee of Repdems	20	9,950
TOTAL		\$1,544,032

United for Washington also appears to have been one of the more selective committees, distributing its funds to only 54 candidates, compared with 136 candidates supported by the Public Employees Action Committee, 131 by the Council for Economic Progress, and 127 recipients of SAVPAC contributions.

The size of contributions by these 20 PACs ranged from \$25 to \$16,500 and the amount of the average contribution was \$850. For the senate with four-year terms, contributions are generally higher than in the house, and the average contribution by one of the top 20 PACs to a senate candidate in 1984 was \$1,039, while the average to a house candidate was \$792. Table 3.4 (Senate) and Table 3.5 (House) list for each PAC its minimum and maximum contributions, the size of the average contribution, and the recipient of each PAC's largest contributions.

TABLE 3.4. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, SIZE OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO SENATE CANDIDATES, 1984

COMMITTEE NAME	Average Amount	Smallest Amount	Largest Amount	Recipients of Largest Contributions
Affordable Housing Council	\$675	\$250	\$3,000	Diane Woody, D-39
Bar PAC	743	100	2,100	Stuart Halsan, D-20
Care PAC	666	200	2,000	Alex Deccio, R-14
Committee of Repdems	221	100	300	Bob McCaslin, R-4; Lois Stratton, D-3; Alex Deccio, R-14; George Sellar, R-12
Council for Economic Progress	258	150	500	R. Ted Bottiger, D-2
Fair Competition Council	689	300	1,000	Lowell Peterson, D-40; Dick Hemstad, R-22; Jerry Saling, R-5; R. Ted Bottiger, D-2
First Associates	626	150	1,350	Bill Kiskaddon, R-1
LAWPAC	721	250	3,250	Stuart Halsan, D-20
Public Employees Action Committee	457	50	1,200	Marc Gaspard, D-25
PULSE	1,450	100	4,650	Donn Charnley, D-1
Realtors PAC WA	1,263	250	4,000	Ellen Craswell, R-23; Diane Woody, D-39; Bill Kiskaddon, R-1
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	490	100	1,000	Art Broback, R-28
United for Washington	9,200	2,000	16,500	Bill Fuller, R-20
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	242	50	800	Diane Woody, D-39
Wa St Dental PAC	793	200	4,000	R. Ted Bottiger, D-2
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	333	100	1,200	R. Ted Bottiger, D-2
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	1,250	300	4,400	Stuart Halsan, D-20
Wa Affordable Housing Council	433	250	2,000	Ellen Craswell, R-23
Wa Federation of State Employees	3,365	300	8,502	Stuart Halsan, D-20
Wa Medical PAC	964	50	3,600	Diane Woody, D-39

TABLE 3.5. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, SIZE OF CONTRIBUTIONS
TO HOUSE CANDIDATES, 1984

COMMITTEE NAME	Average Amount	Smallest Amount	Largest Amount	Recipients of Largest Contributions
Affordable Housing Council	\$862	\$75	\$2,500	Joe Williams, R-41; Dave Hulbert, R-39; John Carlson, R-34
Bar PAC	502	50	1,600	Marlin Appelwick, D-46
Care PAC	379	200	3,000	Wayne Ehlers, D-2
Committee of Repdems	646	100	3,000	Warren Root, R-15 Paul Zellinsky, D-23
Council for Economic Progress	185	100	500	Gary Nelson, R-21; Wayne Ehlers, D-2
Fair Competition Council	661	200	1,300	Harold Clayton, R-15; Jim Wright, R-22; Dick Bond, R-6; Dick Barnes, R-33
First Associates	449	25	1,400	Bruce Addison, R-34
LAWPAC	662	50	4,250	Ed Putka, D-18
Public Employees Action Committee	349	50	1,200	Richard Doc Hastings, R-16; Jerry Ellis, D-14
PULSE	893	50	4,500	Wes Wilburn, D-1
Realtors PAC WA	985	100	5,000	Linda Thomas, R-26
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	395	100	850	Paul Zellinsky, D-23
United for Washington	6,496	1,000	16,000	Linda Thomas, R-26
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	149	25	500	Paul King, D-44
Wa St Dental PAC	466	200	2,000	Georgette Valle, D-34; Linda Smith, R-18; Janet Nelson, R-44
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	209	100	1,100	Dennis Heck, D-17
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	733	100	2,800	Peter Kremen, D-42
Wa Affordable Housing Council	385	25	1,500	Karen Schmidt, R-23
Wa Federation of State Employees	1,860	190	6,150	Jerry Ellis, D-14
Wa Medical PAC	958	25	3,045	Peter Brooks, R-16

TABLE 3.6. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 CONTRIBUTIONS TO
LEGISLATIVE CANDIDATES, BY PERCENTAGE TO DEMOCRATS

COMMITTEE	DEMOCRATS			REPUBLICANS		
	N	\$Amount	%	N	\$Amount	%
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	105	87,836	99.8%	1	200	0.2%
Wa Federation of State Employees	95	210,787	97.7%	4	5,000	2.3%
PULSE	82	84,248	93.3%	6	6,052	6.7%
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	58	11,235	87.4%	17	1,625	12.6%
LAWPAC	77	56,075	79.0%	28	14,924	21.0%
Public Employees Action Committee	75	28,050	55.1%	61	22,825	44.9%
Bar PAC	30	17,800	53.6%	29	15,425	46.4%
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	57	14,250	52.4%	57	12,950	47.6%
Council for Economic Progress	69	13,400	50.7%	62	13,050	49.3%
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	67	26,475	49.6%	60	26,925	50.4%
Wa St Dental PAC	51	26,225	46.1%	54	30,700	53.9%
Committee of Repdems	8	4,250	42.7%	12	5,700	57.3%
First Associates	48	19,150	35.2%	64	35,225	64.8%
Care PAC	20	9,350	34.7%	39	17,600	65.3%
Wa Affordable Housing Council	23	8,200	31.4%	43	17,925	68.6%
Wa Medical PAC	39	27,725	26.7%	69	75,955	73.3%
Fair Competition Council	28	16,600	25.4%	70	48,850	74.6%
Realtors PAC WA	31	21,400	19.7%	73	87,400	80.3%
Affordable Housing Council	9	8,000	19.0%	42	34,099	81.0%
United for Washington	9	32,046	8.4%	45	348,500	91.6%
TOTAL		723,102			820,930	

TABLE 3.7. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984; PERCENTAGES OF
TOTAL LEGISLATIVE CONTRIBUTIONS BY CANDIDATE STATUS

COMMITTEE NAME	CANDIDATE TYPES:		
	Incumbents	Challengers	Open Seats
Affordable Housing Council	58%	10%	32%
Bar PAC	67%	13%	20%
Care PAC	86%	3%	11%
Committee of Repdems	65%	0%	35%
Council for Economic Progress	77%	4%	19%
Fair Competition Council	68%	8%	24%
First Associates	74%	4%	23%
LAWPAC	60%	22%	18%
Public Employees Action Committee	80%	5%	16%
PULSE	21%	43%	35%
Realtors PAC WA	57%	15%	28%
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	81%	3%	16%
United For Washington	31%	31%	38%
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committee	56%	29%	14%
Wa St Dental PAC	66%	11%	22%
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	86%	6%	8%
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	32%	42%	26%
Wa Affordable Housing Council	69%	7%	24%
Wa Federation of State Employees	31%	40%	28%
Wa Medical PAC	60%	13%	26%

Having looked at the party lineup of the candidates supported by the 20 biggest PACs and the incumbent-vs.-challenger figures, it is of interest to see how each PAC fared--how many and what proportion of its candidates were elected. The number of winners and losers for each PAC is shown in Table 3.8. The Committee of Repdems had the best record for the relatively small amount that it put into legislative campaigns in 1984, having only 1 loser and 18 general election winners. The Council for Economic Progress supported more losers than winners. The other four PACs with the lowest win-loss records were United for Washington, Washington State Labor Council, PULSE, and Washington Federation of State Employees. In terms of dollars spent, these four were among the six highest.

TABLE 3.8. TOP 20 PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, WINNERS AND
LOSERS SUPPORTED IN LEGISLATIVE RACES, 1984

COMMITTEE NAME	PRIMARY		GENERAL ELECTION		WIN %
	Losers	Winners	Losers	Winners	
Committee of Repdems	1	18	1		95%
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	0	106	8		93%
Wa St Dental PAC	3	93	9		91%
Care PAC	0	53	6		90%
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	3	110	14		89%
Public Employees Action Committee	3	115	18		86%
First Associates	2	95	15		86%
Bar PAC	4	47	8		85%
Wa Medical PAC	6	87	15		85%
Wa Affordable Housing Council	1	55	10		85%
Wa St Assn of the UA C&L Committe	1	61	13		82%
LAWPAC	7	80	18		82%
Fair Competition Council	4	74	20		79%
Realtors PAC WA	2	80	22		78%
Affordable Housing Council	1	39	11		78%
Wa Federation of State Employees	4	65	30		68%
PULSE	5	54	29		65%
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	5	65	36		64%
United For Washington	2	27	25		52%
Council for Economic Progress	4	14	16		47%

In the Public Disclosure Commission's 1978 Election Financing Fact Book, the top 10 PACs in terms of legislative contributions were identified and their legislative contribution totals were listed for the years 1974, 1976, and 1978.(2) All but one of the top 10 PACs of 1978 were in the top 10 of 1984. Table 3.9 below is a continuation of that list, adding three more biennial election years since 1978 so that the record spans a decade beginning with the first regular legislative election after the disclosure law went into effect. The totals include contributions to the four caucus campaign committees as well as contributions to candidates.

TABLE 3.9. CONTRIBUTIONS TO LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGNS AND CAUCUSES
BY 10 MAJOR PACS, 1974-1984

COMMITTEE	CONTRIBUTIONS					
	1974	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984
United for Washington	\$94,148	140,675	162,855	348,798	306,166	380,546
Wa Fed. of State Employees	9,636	22,020	33,552	107,798	149,405	217,970
Realtors PAC WA	4,937	6,216	33,970	47,040	55,720	108,800
Wa Medical PAC	15,326	23,000	20,296	32,980	38,710	117,650
PULSE	76,526	80,197	73,560	138,057	152,468	93,020
Wa St Labor Council	31,540	31,483	90,420	59,916	73,307	90,816
LAWPAC				36,165	70,552	74,014
Fair Competition Council	33,600	39,970	40,549	50,175	44,751	67,400
Wa St Dental PAC	4,700	32,175	47,670	68,225	71,475	60,180
First Associates	19,875	26,298	31,219	40,640	39,025	55,275

In every one of those six election years, United for Washington has been the PAC with the highest total given to legislative campaigns. This committee made its biggest increase in 1980, when its contributions of \$348,798 more than doubled the 1978 amount of \$162,855. The Washington Federation of State Employees, which spent less than \$10,000 in the 1974 legislative campaigns, was spending more than 10 times as much in 1980 and had doubled that amount again in four years. Contributions by the Washington Medical PAC increased only modestly until the 1984 elections, when the total contributed was triple the 1982 total for that PAC. The Realtors' PAC is another that was not heavily involved in the 1974 elections, when most of its contributions were in \$50 amounts and the total was less than \$5,000. In 1984 it gave that much to a single candidate and its total contributions were more than 20 times as much as the 1974 total.

The partisan division of legislative candidate contributions by the ten top PACs has been tracked since 1978. Table 3.10 below shows the percentage of its total legislative contributions that each PAC gave to Democratic candidates (caucus contributions are not included). In general, party preferences have remained

TABLE 3.10. PERCENTAGE OF LEGISLATIVE CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS GIVEN TO DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES BY 10 MAJOR PACS, 1978-1984

COMMITTEE	% TO DEMOCRATS			
	1978	1980	1982	1984
United for Washington	22%	5%	12%	8%
First Associates	30%	25%	15%	35%
Fair Competition Council	32%	24%	19%	25%
Wa Medical PAC	38%	**	28%	27%
Realtors PAC WA	38%	22%	13%	20%
Wa St Dental PAC	44%	36%	37%	46%
LAWPAC	**	79%	91%	79%
PULSE	85%	98%	93%	93%
Wa Federation of State Employees	93%	99%	95%	98%
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	99%	100%	100%	100%

** Not computed

consistent from year to year. The biggest change occurred in 1980, when every one of the committees that had preferred Republicans in 1978 (giving less than 50 percent to Democrats) became even more Republican-leaning in 1980, and the three committees that had given most of their money to Democrats in 1978 all gave an even higher percentage to Democratic candidates in the 1980 elections. It should be noted that the 1978 election had resulted in a house of representatives that was evenly divided, 49 Democratic members and 49 Republicans; in the elections of 1980 both parties and their supporters were out to change that situation in their favor, which may explain in part the increased partisanship of the PACs' 1980 contributions.

Case Studies.

To illustrate the flow of PAC money into legislative races, two 1984 campaigns were selected--the one race in each house of the legislature that had the greatest number of contributions from the top 20 PACs. These were the 22nd district senate race and the contest for house position 1 in the 3rd district. These were neither the costliest nor the closest elections in their respective houses, and candidates in some of the other districts received more PAC dollars than these candidates. They represent two very different situations: one an open race with no incumbent involved, and the other a contest between an incumbent senator and an incumbent representative.

In the 22nd district, one-term Republican incumbent Senator Dick Hemstad was challenged by Mike Kreidler, a Democratic member of the house since 1977. The race was the senate's third most expensive, with the two candidates reporting total expenditures of more than \$135,000. It was not a particularly close finish, Kreidler winning with 56.5 percent of the votes cast. In one respect it was unique: each candidate reported the names of more than 1,000 contributors. Only two other candidates of the 63 who filed for senate positions in 1984 reported even as many as 500 contributors.

The 3rd district house race had Bill Day, Jr., a Democrat, competing with Margaret Leonard for an open seat. Both were familiar names to Spokane voters. Day's father was a long-time legislator who was defeated in 1980 for re-election to the senate. The younger Day ran in the house primary in 1982, when Leonard was the incumbent. Dennis Dellwo won the Democratic primary that year and went on to unseat Leonard in the general election. In 1984 Day won the Democratic nomination and went on to win the general election with 55 percent of the vote to Leonard's 45 percent.

These two races, then, were neither the closest nor the costliest of 1984, yet they were competitive and attracted support from the full spectrum of interests represented by PACs. The flow of PAC money into these two campaigns is close to being typical for the two types of campaign situations and can be used to illustrate some points about candidate fund-raising and the PACs.

For most of the calendar year, candidates and political committees file reports of receipts and expenditures (PDC Form C-4) on a monthly basis if they have any activity to report. That schedule changes during the campaign period, and reports are filed more frequently. A C-4 report is due 21 days before each election (primary and general), 7 days before each election, and 21 days after each election. Table 3.11 shows the receipts reported by each of the four candidates for these reporting periods, with a separate column for each candidate showing the amounts of PAC contributions that are included. The PACs include not just the top 20, but all state PACs.

The first report date in Table 3.11 summarizes all contributions received through the end of June, and the amounts shown there illustrate a common difference between incumbents and non-incumbents. Kreidler's contributions for the 1984 campaign started with a fund-raising event in October 1983, as had been his practice since his first house term in 1977. Fund-raising for the Hemstad campaign began in January 1984. As of the August report (21 days before the uncontested primary), Hemstad's total contributions amounted to almost \$37,000, or nearly half of the total he eventually received, and Kreidler had received over \$24,000 by that time. In contrast, Day had collected just \$4,416--just 10 percent of his eventual total--at this point, and Leonard's receipts were about 14 percent of her final amount.

The two non-incumbent house candidates had their biggest fund-raising periods after the primary election: Day leading the other candidates with \$14,330 collected during the two-week period that ended a week before the general election and Leonard leading the others with \$12,501, or 31 percent of her total receipts, not reported until after the general election.

The flow of PAC money, in fact of all contributions, was strongest during the seven weeks of the campaign period covered by three reports--the October 9 post-primary report and the pre-general reports of October 16 and October 30. Approximately half of all the money received by the four candidates came during the seven weeks covered by those three reports. The two non-incumbents received relatively little PAC money prior to that period--\$5,600 between them--compared with \$21,057 for the two incumbents.

Three of the top 20 PACs as well as the anti-abortion Human Life PAC gave to both Day and Leonard in the 3rd district house election. Of the top 20 PACs there were eight that gave some money to both Kreidler and Hemstad. Both of these candidates reported \$500 contributions from the Washington Medical PAC during the last pre-general filing period. The two leading public employee organizations, PULSE and the Washington Federation of State Employees, gave what might be considered as token contributions (\$150 and \$100, respectively) to Hemstad during the first six months of the year and nothing after that, but gave much more to Kreidler as the campaign progressed. During each of the reporting periods, Kreidler had reportable contributions from the WFSE reaching a total of \$6,825.

Spreading contributions out over the course of a campaign rather than making a single large contribution is fairly typical of how the union, and other large PACs, distributed funds to candidates. Hemstad's largest PAC contributor was United for Washington, which gave \$3,000 during the period covered by the August 28 report and another \$3,000 before September 11. His most frequent PAC contributors were the trial lawyers' organization, LAWPAC, which gave a total of \$2,100 spread over the entire campaign, and the Fair Competition Council with four contributions for a total of \$1,000. In the Spokane house race, United for Washington spread its total of \$12,500 given to Leonard over five separate contributions. Day received four contributions of \$500 each from the state labor council's PAC, plus an additional \$150 as one of the nine PAC contributions that he received in the month of December. The Fair Competition Council also gave a total of \$1,000 to Day in four installments. There was nothing on the reports filed by the candidates or committees to indicate that any of the repeat contributions were in fulfillment of pledges--pledges that would have been reportable as contributions at the time the pledges were given.

This more detailed look at four campaigns supports some generalizations about campaign finance and the role of PACs:

Incumbents get an earlier start in fund-raising than non-incumbents and PAC money is a part of that early money.

Although fund-raising for legislative elections begins a year before an election or even earlier and continues after the election is over, most of the action takes place during the months of September and October. In general, PACs concentrate their giving during that same period.

Instead of making a single one-time contribution, many of the larger PACs spread their contributions, giving several times to the same candidates during the course of a campaign.

It is not unusual to find the same PAC giving to both candidates for the same position.

Conclusion. From all of the foregoing data about PACs-- their win-loss records, the division of their funds along political party lines, their support of challengers vs. incumbents, the size of their contributions--it may seem difficult to find a pattern and easy to claim that amidst such diversity there are no patterns. However, what also emerges from looking at the contribution behavior of major PACs is that there are two distinct types of PACs. One type gives relatively equal amounts to most of the candidates it supports, buys tickets to legislators' fund-raisers, tends to favor incumbents regardless of party, but will give to the winner's post-election benefit event after an incumbent has been defeated. Its largest contributions sometimes go to legislative leaders, even when those legislators do not face serious opposition. It can usually show a high percentage of winners among the candidates it supports.

The second type is more selective in giving its support, yet takes more risks. Rather than nearly uniform amounts to all candidates, it will concentrate large amounts in selected races. To make sure its dollars go as far as possible, it will make in-kind contributions. It will not merely passively endorse candidates after they have announced, it will recruit candidates and will monitor their campaigns. They lose some big ones and their win-loss averages are not so impressive as those of the first type.

The first type of PAC seeks good will, or, to use the term that has become so common, it wants "access." The second type has a more ambitious program: it wants to shape the composition of the legislature more to its liking. Both types are to be found among the business PACs and among the union PACs, among the pro-Democratic PACs and among the pro-Republican PACs. The second type, however, is more likely at this time to be rather partial to one party or the other.

The second type is more sophisticated than the first. One might say "more mature" in terms of development, since some of them started out more like the first type and have evolved into the second. There are, of course, some PACs at various intermediate stages of this development scheme.

Another observation would be that competing interests seem to be in close balance in financing legislative campaigns. United for Washington, the business PAC and the one with the largest war chest, had almost as much money as the three biggest union PACs combined. It gave heavily to Republicans; the unions

supported Democrats. There is nothing new or surprising about that. But in selecting candidates, neither business nor labor showed any great delight with the status quo as it existed in 1984. Both United for Washington and the labor committees gave larger sums to those opposing incumbent legislators than they gave to incumbents seeking to retain their positions, labor backing Democratic challengers and business backing Republican challengers. The outcome?: aside from one other much smaller PAC, the committee with almost as many losers as winners was the biggest PAC in the state, the most pro-Republican PAC--United for Washington. The next three committees with the lowest win-loss records were the three biggest pro-Democratic union committees.

III. FOOTNOTES

(1) Frank Sorauf, "Political Action Committees in American Politics: An Overview," What Price PACs?, 47.

(2) Inclusion of a short-lived PAC, the United Public Employee Coalition, made a total of 11 committees listed in 1978.

IV. IDEOLOGICAL PACS IN WASHINGTON

All but a very few of the PACs registered in Washington and involved in state-level elections are clearly affiliated with some particular economic interest or organization--a labor union, a corporation, an industry, a professional association, or a trade association. Very few PACs in Washington are single-issue or ideological PACs.

These types of PACs at the national level have attracted a great deal of attention and much of the criticism of PACs in general is really intended for them. In philosophy, they may be conservative--NCPAC, the National Conservative Political Action Committee--or liberal like the National Committee for an Effective Congress. Other prominent examples of such PACs include the League of Conservation Voters, the National Right to Life Committee, the National Abortion Rights Action League, and Jerry Falwell's I Love America PAC.

There were only 12 committees functioning in Washington state politics during 1984 that might be included in this category of PACs. For some of them, their reported expenditures were so minimal as to indicate clearly that they were not very much involved in the elections of that year. The 12 committees and their total expenditures in 1984 follow:

Committee Name	1984 Expenditures
Concerned Christian Citizens for Political Action	\$ 5,881
Gun Owners' PAC of Washington	110
Human Life PAC	14,596
Northwest Black Non-Partisan Association	2,165
Right to Bear Arms Political Victory Fund	19,037
Seattle Municipal Elections Committee for Gays and Lesbians (SEAMEC)	4,006
Thurston County Women's Political Fund	2,019
Washington Environmental PAC	16,810

1984
Expenditures

Committee Name

((Continued))

Wa St National Abortion Rights Action League	5,285
Wa St National Organization of Women PAC	7,971
Washington Taxpayers' Association PAC	1,686
Wa St Women's Political Caucus Campaign Fund	11,070

Although none of these committees approached the top 20 business and labor PACs in their total participation in state and local campaigns, the following account summarizes the reported 1984 activities of the four largest of these committees.

The Right to Bear Arms Political Victory Fund in Bellevue is affiliated with a national group, the Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms. During calendar year 1984 the committee received contributions from 305 individuals and organizations, all but a very few of them from outside the state. Most receipts were in amounts of \$25 or \$50 and the largest contribution received was for \$500. The committee donated \$150 to a legislative candidate in Arizona, \$100 to a candidate in Texas, and \$14,310 to Washington state candidates. Included in this amount were 17 contributions of \$200 each, one contribution of \$250, a \$60 in-kind contribution, and two contributions totalling \$10,600 to Mike Kenyon, Republican state senate candidate in the 11th district.

The Washington Environmental PAC in 1984 raised more than \$14,000 from approximately 350 persons. It made no direct contributions to candidates in the 1984 elections. It spent \$7,168 for salaries and expenses and \$4,254 in connection with a debate between the two nominees for governor, John Spellman and Booth Gardner.

Incomplete reports filed by the Human Life PAC for 1984 listed names of 104 contributors. Receipts amounted to \$15,710, including small unidentified contributions. Through October 29, 1984, the committee reported \$8,600 given to 29 legislative candidates.

The Washington State Women's Political Caucus Campaign Fund received approximately \$5,800 in contributions during 1984 from 315 persons and groups. Together with an approximately equal amount carried forward from the previous year, it had enough to give \$500 to a woman congressional candidate, \$5,690 to legislative candidates, and \$1,275 to other local, judicial, and executive candidates, including \$250 to oppose Initiative 471, the measure to prohibit public funding of abortions.

In legislative campaigns, these committees have less overall impact than the business and union PACs, but they are more selective than most of the larger committees in giving their financial support. They concentrate their donations on a few elections rather than spreading their resources over several. For example, the \$10,600 that the Right to Bear Arms committee gave Kenyon was his second largest contribution and was more than three times the amount of his next highest contribution.

Although there is nothing in this study to confirm it, there is a possibility that the individual contributors who sustain the ideological PACs are a different group of people than those who contribute to the business and union PACs or to the regular party organizations. These committees, therefore, can be said to provide an additional avenue for political participation. A study of 2,100 persons who contributed to the Democratic or Republican parties or to one of the right- or left-wing PACs during 1982 found some demographic differences between Republican and conservative contributors and some difference between Democratic party contributors and liberal PAC contributors.(1)

In writing state laws, Washington voters have opportunities for direct legislation that do not exist at the federal level--the initiative and the referendum. Many issues have reached the ballot in those ways and many more have been attempted but fail to get signatures of enough voters to go on the ballot. The supporters and sometimes the opponents of these measures are often groups that might be considered as single-issue committees, and indeed have counterparts among the registered federal committees, but they were not considered to be political action committees for the purpose of this study unless they became involved in candidate elections.

IV. FOOTNOTE

(1) John C. Green and James L. Gath, "The Party Irregulars," Psychology Today (October 1984), 46-51.

V. PACS AS VIEWED BY THE CANDIDATES

The preceding sections of this report on political action committees and their place in financing elections in Washington state have dealt with their growth, their membership, the sources of their funds. PAC members have been surveyed, and the expenditures of 20 major PACs have been summarized and analyzed. The examination of PACs would be incomplete without also turning to those who have been both the beneficiaries and the targets of the PACs--the candidates. Many of them may not even have become candidates had it not been for the assistance of PACs.

From the list of 320 persons who ran for legislative office in Washington state in 1984, a total of 119 were selected at random and were interviewed during the summer of 1985 by volunteers using a questionnaire developed by commission staff. The sample was nearly evenly divided between winners and losers, having 61 persons who said they gained the legislative office they were seeking in 1984 and 58 who did not win.

In degrees of experience as candidates and campaigners they ranged from 44 whose 1984 campaigns had been their first venture as candidates to 2 who said they had been on the ballot 14 times. Their average experience was 3.1 elections. In addition to being candidates themselves, all but 12 in the sample reported having been involved in others' campaigns, some reporting numbers in the hundreds. As a group, they were well aware of PAC contributions in their campaigns. Only 12 percent said they had received no PAC contributions, 2.5 percent didn't know whether they had or not, and 85.5 percent acknowledged having received PAC contributions. Asked this question, "Would you say the total amount of PAC money given to you was a large or small part of your total campaign finances?" 58 percent of those receiving PAC money replied that it was a large part, 38 percent said a small part, and the rest didn't know. How many dollars or what proportion of the total it takes to constitute a "large part" is a subjective judgment, but the survey shows at least that more than a majority of the candidates, winners as well as losers, had the impression that PAC money had been a large part of their campaign treasury.

A number of statements about elections, most of them concerning PACs in some way, were read to the candidates, and they were asked to tell whether they agreed, strongly agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed. The numbers and percentages responding follows:(1)

Table 5.1 CANDIDATES' RESPONSES TO STATEMENTS ABOUT PACS

Please tell me whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements about PACs:

	Candidates' Responses				
	SA	A	D	SD	No Opinion
PACs make it easier for those who are not personally wealthy to run for office.	20% (24)	49% (58)	20% (24)	4% (5)	7% (8)
PAC are harmful because they are more inclined to support incumbents rather than newcomers.	10% (12)	29% (35)	45% (54)	5% (6)	10% (12)
PACs and the money they put into campaigns are responsible for escalating the costs of campaigning.	20% (24)	42% (50)	27% (32)	8% (10)	3% (3)
PACs are making campaigns cleaner by giving money directly to candidates rather than through the parties.	3% (4)	25% (30)	39% (46)	13% (16)	19% (23)
PACs are responsible for a decline in the importance of the political party.	11% (13)	34% (40)	41% (49)	9% (11)	5% (6)
The costs of political campaigns keep many good potential candidates from running for office.	32% (38)	32% (38)	28% (33)	7% (8)	2% (2)
People who give to campaigns are more likely to get access to policy makers than are non-contributors.	22% (26)	46% (55)	20% (24)	7% (8)	5% (6)
There should be a limit on how much any one individual or group can give to a single candidate.	31% (37)	36% (43)	23% (27)	6% (7)	4% (5)

The majority of the candidates disagreed with statements that might be considered negative about PACs and agreed with positive statements. Of those expressing an opinion on the statement, 69 percent either agreed or strongly agreed that PACs

make it easier for those who are not personally wealthy to run for office. A majority disagreed or strongly disagreed with statements that PACs are responsible for a decline in the importance of the political party, and that PACs are harmful because they are more inclined to support incumbents than newcomers.

In other questions dealing with campaign funding, 64 percent agreed that costs keep many good potential candidates from running, 68 percent agreed that campaign contributors are more likely than non-contributors to get access to policy makers, 62 percent credit PACs and their money with escalating campaign costs, and 70 percent believe there should be limits on how much any one individual or group can give to a single candidate.

One of the chief purposes of campaign finance disclosure is to clear up some of the mystery and suspicion surrounding the sources of campaign money. With the names of a candidate's contributors on the public record, that information is available to the general public, to the press, and to the candidates' opponents--and the opponents are free to use that information in the campaign, to raise as a legitimate campaign issue the question of the sources of an opponent's financial support.

Thirty of the candidates surveyed, or about one in four, said that sources of campaign funds had become an issue in their campaigns. One of them, a veteran of 20 campaigns including three as a candidate, said that sources of campaign funds are "always at issue in elections." There were more candidates who said that their side had raised the issue than there were who said their opponents had used the money issue against them.

According to those who said that the money sources issue had been used against them, the most frequent accusation was that they were being supported by "union bosses." One successful candidate said that a single large contribution of more than \$10,000 to his opponent from a business PAC had raised such questions that it worked to the candidate's advantage, not the opponent's.

Eighteen of the candidates, almost one-third of the number interviewed who had won their elections, responded yes to the question:

"During a session, or at any other time, has anyone made you aware--subtly or otherwise--that PAC support helped last time or may be withheld next time?"

In eight cases, the person making such a statement was said to have been connected with a PAC as a member, officer, or lobbyist. Other types of positions mentioned included lobbyists, other legislators, and party officers.

There were some differences in their responses between those who were winners in their 1984 elections and the losers. Of the losers, 82 percent agreed that campaign costs keep many good potential candidates from running, while only 46 percent of the winners were in agreement with that statement. A majority of the losers agreed that PACs are harmful because they favor incumbents, but less than one-third of the winners agreed.

The same set of statements was presented to a sample of PAC officers for their reactions. Candidates and PAC officers generally reacted in the same way to the statements about PACs and campaign funding, with the PAC officers being stronger on the positive statements and fewer of them agreeing with the negative statements.

Table 5.2 PERCENTAGES OF PAC OFFICERS AND CANDIDATES AGREEING WITH STATEMENTS ABOUT PACS

Percent who agree or strongly agree. ("No opinion" responses omitted.)

	<u>PAC Officers</u>	<u>Candidates</u>
PACs make it easier for those who are not personally wealthy to run for office.	89%	74%
PACs are harmful because they are more inclined to support incumbents rather than newcomers.	13%	44%
PACs and the money they put into campaigns are responsible for escalating the costs of campaigning.	33%	64%
PACs are making campaigns cleaner by giving money directly to candidates rather than through the parties.	64%	35%
PACs are responsible for a decline in the importance of the political party.	28%	47%

VI. PACS AND THE POLITICAL PARTIES

Some observers suggest that the increasing amounts of money that PACs make available to candidates is at least partly responsible for a decline in the influence of the political parties, with the result that the candidates and office-holders feel more accountable to the PACs and the interests they represent than to the parties whose labels they wear.

Rather than a direct cause/effect relationship, others say that the circumstances and societal changes that have been hostile to the continued flourishing of strong parties have been most favorable for the growth and development of PACs. Sorauf has listed the conditions that led to the heyday of party organizations in America--the days of party machines, patronage and favors--and has summarized changes and developments that make the political world of the 1980's different from that era.(1) Among these changes are the use of electronic media and a whole new campaign technology supplanting the precinct foot soldiers of the past, merit systems replacing patronage in public employment, the direct primary instead of candidate anointment by party bosses, and a better educated and more independent electorate. Lee Ann Elliott, now a member of the Federal Election Commission, calling PACs a "rational and healthy" addition to the political process, terms them the "precincts of the 80's" in recognizing one of the impacts that increased mobility has had on political behavior.(2)

Larry Sabato, however, is one scholar who disagrees with the general view that the influence of the major parties has been declining while the influence of the PACs has been rising. He claims that the parties and the PACs are coexisting symbiotically--using one another--and that the parties have lately regenerated themselves at the national level.(3)

Experience and the record in Washington state tend to support Sabato's view. Because of the open primary for one reason, Washington has never been known for having strong political parties. The machines of New Jersey or Chicago never ran things in Washington. Long before concern about "image" started talk about personality-based politics rather than party-based, Washington voters were splitting their tickets and casting their votes for candidates rather than for party labels.

Although still lagging far behind the PACs, Democratic and Republican party organizations in Washington have increased their receipts and expenditures since 1976 at a rate higher than that of the PACs. Total spending by all PACs at the state level

reached \$5.2 million in 1984, about triple the 1976 PAC spending of \$1.86 million. Over that same period, total spending by the Republican State Central Committee went from \$192 thousand in 1976 to \$1.13 million in 1984--almost a six-fold increase, while the Washington State Democratic Committee almost quadrupled its expenditures, going from \$159 thousand in 1976 to \$608 thousand in 1984.

TABLE 6.1. EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE TYPES, 1976-1984
(in thousands of dollars)

	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984
DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEES:					
Wa St Democratic Committee	\$159	\$155	\$249	\$325	\$608
Senate Demo Campaign Committee	67	53	96	150	159
House Demo Caucus Committee	82	109	111	91	131
All other Demo committees	304	204	468	476	549
DEMOCRAT TOTAL	\$611	\$520	\$924	\$1,042	\$1,447
REPUBLICAN COMMITTEES:					
Republican State Central Cmte	\$192	\$280	\$1,023	\$989	\$1,132
Senate Republican Campaign Cmte	82	62	137	125	172
House Republican PAC	45	92	134	183	221
All other Republican committees	489	561	672	885	841
REPUBLICAN TOTAL	\$809	\$995	\$1,966	\$2,182	\$2,365
POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES:					
Business committees	\$1,257	\$1,031	\$2,210	\$2,238	\$3,248
Union committees	602	739	1,298	1,672	1,841
Miscellaneous committees	4	15	82	89	110
PACS TOTAL	\$1,864	\$1,785	\$3,590	\$3,999	\$5,199

Only a portion of these dollars, of course, went into candidate campaigns, either as direct monetary contributions or as in-kind expenditures, but the total of their funds directed specifically at campaigns rose from \$18,035 for the Democratic state committee in 1978 to \$103,978 in 1984, and from \$42,200 for the Republican state committee in 1978 to \$290,635 in 1984.

TABLE 6.2. CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY WASHINGTON STATE PARTY
COMMITTEES, ELECTION YEARS 1978 THROUGH 1984

Washington State Democratic Central Committee

	1978	1980	1982	1984
CONTRIBUTIONS MADE:				
To legislative candidates	\$14,625	\$9,700	\$8,975	\$13,360
To other candidates	\$3,410	\$6,565		
CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES:				
Supporting specific candidates			\$44,597	\$90,618
Opposing specific candidates				
TOTAL DIRECTED TO CAMPAIGNS	\$18,035	\$16,265	\$53,572	\$103,978

Republican State Committee

	1978	1980	1982	1984
CONTRIBUTIONS MADE:				
To legislative candidates	\$42,200	\$142,457		\$21,774
To other candidates		\$57,716		\$78,826
CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES:				
Supporting specific candidates			\$144,789	\$186,851
Opposing specific candidates			\$31,242	\$3,184
TOTAL DIRECTED TO CAMPAIGNS	\$42,200	\$200,173	\$176,031	\$290,635

Dramatic as these increases may be, the fact remains that it is not the political parties that provide the funds for political campaigns in Washington state. The total amount that went directly from the two state parties to candidates in 1984 is only 2 percent of the total \$19 million spent by all candidates everywhere in the state that year. The combined candidate contributions/expenditures of the two major party state organizations--\$395 thousand--is only slightly more than the \$381 thousand that a single PAC--United for Washington--gave to legislative candidates. Adding in the dollars that came from other official and unofficial party organizations such as the county and district committees, party clubs, and women's groups the legislative candidates had \$457,508, or 7.6 percent of their total spending amounts, from party sources.(4) For Democratic legislative candidates, the amount was \$164,151; for Republicans, \$293,357.

Both state parties have increased their income steadily during the period covered by this study, election years 1978 through 1984. For the Democratic state committee, contributions received (not including income from such sources as interest, refunds, bingo, raffles and sales--all of which are also termed "contributions" in the context of the disclosure reports), have regularly doubled every biennium, going from \$61 thousand in 1978 to \$123 thousand in 1980, to \$226 thousand in 1982 and to \$448 thousand in 1984.

TABLE 6.3. CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED BY WASHINGTON STATE PARTY
COMMITTEES, ELECTION YEARS 1978 THROUGH 1984

	STATE DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE:			
	1978	1980	1982	1984
CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED:				
From individuals	\$50,140	\$46,023	\$96,361	\$153,873
From committees, corporations, and other organizations	\$9,962	\$76,631	\$123,305	\$278,375
From subordinate party organizations	\$1,063	\$416	\$6,299	\$16,028
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED	\$61,165	\$123,070	\$225,965	\$448,276
	REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE:			
	1978	1980	1982	1984
CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED:				
From individuals	\$199,700	\$729,950	\$731,868	\$1,002,423
From committees, corporations, and other organizations	\$50,138	\$151,340	\$81,532	\$229,073
From subordinate party organizations	\$24,732	\$17,553	\$2,303	\$12,801
TOTAL CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED	\$274,570	\$898,852	\$815,703	\$1,244,297
COMBINED TOTAL, BOTH PARTIES:	\$335,735	\$1,021,922	\$1,041,668	\$1,692,573

During the same period, contributions to the Republican state committee rose from \$275 thousand in 1978 to \$1.2 million in 1984. The contributor base has also increased, most notably for the Republicans. The state party listed 5,444 individual contributors and 244 organizational contributors (businesses, committees, clubs, etc.) in 1978. In 1984 the committee reported 17,412 contributors and 319 organizations. The Democratic party contributor base showed a much smaller increase, going from 4,068 individuals and 51 organizations in 1978 to 4,668 individuals and 182 organizations in 1984.

Caucus Committees. Somewhat apart from the statutorily recognized party central committees are the four campaign committees, referred to as caucus committees, organized by members of both of the major parties in both houses of the legislature. While the official party committees have other functions, among them the holding of biennial conventions and the selection of delegates to the presidential nominating conventions, the principal mission of the caucus committee is to elect its candidates. The names of these committees and the amounts they received and spent in 1984 are:

	<u>Received(5)</u>	<u>Spent</u>
Senate Demo Campaign Committee	\$161,245	\$158,881
House Demo Caucus Committee	144,532	131,074
Senate Republican Campaign Committee	182,743	156,750
House Republican PAC	228,196	220,762

Caucus committee fund-raising events are often held in Olympia. Purchasers of tickets to these events include lobbyists, legislative staff members, and incumbent legislators. Some of the caucus money comes directly from PACs. The amounts contributed to the caucus committees by PACs in 1984 are shown in Table 6.4. While union PACs decidedly favored the Democratic caucuses, business PACs divided their contributions more evenly between the parties. Many PACs gave to all four caucus committees. When this money finds its way into a candidate's campaign, it has lost its character as PAC money and is identified as a contribution to the candidate by the caucus committee.

TABLE 6.4. PAC CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAUCUS COMMITTEES, 1984

Committee	From Business PACs		From Union PACs	
	N	Amount	N	Amount
Senate Democratic	52	\$27,045	16	\$11,400
Senate Republican	56	\$30,225	3	\$ 3,375
House Democratic	51	\$24,825	19	\$10,473
House Republican	61	\$37,404	6	\$ 3,925

The caucus committees also resemble PACs. They have a special interest: to gain control by electing a majority of their fellow party members to their respective houses of the legislature and to gain for their sponsors the power, privileges, and responsibilities that accompany majority status.

Such committees are not unique to Washington state. Tom Loftus, Speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly, calls them "new political parties emerging"--100 of them.(6) He claims that they fill a void, meeting needs that the regular party organizations have neglected. Not only do they raise money, they also recruit candidates, conduct campaign schools, and provide a variety of support services to their candidates.

In 1984 the caucus committees in Washington state made contributions totaling \$317, 819 to legislative candidates. Much of this was in the form of goods and services rather than money: polling, consultant services, signs, postage, labels, or printing. There were wide variations in the amounts, rather than uniform amounts being given to all of a party's candidates, suggesting targeting of races and distribution on a needs basis. The disclosure reports of each of the four caucus organizations showed the existence of working relationships with the national or state party organizations. The House Republican PAC, for example, reported receiving mailing services and survey assistance valued at approximately \$18,000 from the Republican state committee.

View of PAC officers, candidates and party officials.
Despite the improved financial position of the state party committees, both PAC officers and those who were candidates for the legislature in 1984 are of the opinion that parties are weaker than they have been previously. In a survey conducted as part of the present study, both groups were asked: "Are parties, in general, weaker or stronger than they were 10 years ago?" The responses:

	<u>Weaker</u>	<u>Stronger</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>
Candidates	48%	23%	29%
PAC Officers	53%	13%	35%

While the responses show a greater number saying parties are weaker than those saying they are stronger, it is not a firmly held opinion. Candidates were more likely than PAC officers to say the parties are stronger and less likely to say they are weaker. Of those candidates who said that parties are weaker and who also chose to give a reason, one-third included PACs or

interest groups in their response. Nearly as many mentioned voter independence in some way. Next in frequency was a category of answers having to do with how the parties are run: "lack of leadership," "Democratic policies," "nit-picking--divisiveness within the party," "honesty gap," "media image of the party."

The independence of voters and/or candidates was the reason most commonly given by PAC officers who felt that the parties had become weaker, and PACs or the "awareness of PACs" was the next most frequent reason.

PACs and interest groups do not appear to have replaced the political parties as recruiters of candidates. Of the 82 candidates who told interviewers that they had been approached by someone asking them to run for the legislature, exactly half identified political party officers or committees as the ones making the approach. Only 7 said that an interest group had asked them to run, while 14 identified elected officials or legislators. There were 10 who said a friend or friends encouraged them to run.

Of the seven candidates in 1984 who attributed their candidacies to the suggestion of an interest group, only one was successful in the election. On the other hand, 57 percent of those who ran in response to suggestions from elected officials were elected. Those who claimed to be self-starters and answered in the negative to the question, "Were you approached by anyone asking you to run for the office you sought?" had the best record, with 59 percent of them being elected.

The two top officers of both the Democratic and Republican state party organizations were also interviewed as a part of this study. They were asked to respond to the statement that "PACs are replacing our two-party form of government." One of them called that a ridiculous statement. Two of the officers suggested that the relative importance of political parties fluctuates and that any advantage the PACs may seem to have at present is not permanent.

The Republican officers agreed that PACs have brought new people into the party and that these PAC people generally show more loyalty to the PAC than to the party. Both Democratic officers said that PACs had not brought new members into the party.

Party activity by PAC members. The survey of PAC members done in the course of this study shows that PAC members are certainly more active in the political parties than are other citizens in Washington state. Forty percent of those responding

to the survey had made contributions to political parties either before or since joining a PAC. About one out of five had attended one or more party caucuses or conventions, and 12 percent had held some office in a political party organization.

About 41 percent of the PAC members surveyed agreed that one of their reasons for joining a PAC was that they preferred giving to candidates or PACs rather than to a political party. Of that group, 54 percent reported that they had given to candidates since joining their PAC, but only 20 percent had given to a party organization since joining a PAC, suggesting that, for some at least, the PAC contribution was more likely to substitute for a party contribution than for a candidate contribution. Of those who had given to parties before joining the PAC, 74 percent continued to give to parties after joining a PAC. Considering that most of those pre-PAC party contributors who have not yet made post-PAC party contributions have belonged to their respective PACs less than four years, they cannot be said to have permanently left the community of party contributors.

Conclusion. What appears to be happening in Washington state, rather than the demise of the parties, is a realignment of relationships and functions. Involved in these changes but not necessarily in competition with one another are the formal party organizations, the legislative caucus campaign committees, and the political action committees. Their respective roles in campaign and campaign finance have changed and will probably continue to change.

VI. FOOTNOTES

(1) Frank Sorauf, "The Political Parties: A Tale of Two Eras," Arizona Law Review 22 (1980): 446-450.

(2) Lee Ann Elliott, "Political Action Committees--Precincts of the '80's," Arizona Law Review 22 (1980): 539-540.

(3) Larry J. Sabato, PAC Power: Inside the World of Political Action Committees, p. 142.

(4) This does not include money from legislative party caucus committees, approximately another 5 percent of candidates' total receipts.

(5) Includes balance carried forward from 1983.

(6) Tom Loftus, "The New 'Political Parties' in State Legislatures," State Government 58 (Fall 1985): 108.

Very few PACs in Washington state are ideological or single-issue PACs and the amount of money that gets into candidates' campaign treasuries from them is a very tiny fraction of the total campaign spending. The four largest in 1984 represented gun control opponents, environmentalists, abortion opponents, and the women's political caucus.

The political parties have not withered away while the PACs have been experiencing such lush growth. Measured solely in terms of the amounts of money, the Republican State Central Committee spent six times as much in 1984 as it had in 1976 and the state Democratic Committee almost quadrupled its expenditures. During that same period, total spending by all PACs at the state level had "merely" tripled.

There appear to be two distinct types of PACs: (1) those who take few risks, are not extremely partisan, and who greatly favor incumbents and legislative leaders; and (2) those who are partisan, give strong support to challengers, and are actively involved in candidate selection and training.

The majority of the people who were candidates for the legislature in 1984 said that PAC money had been a large part of their campaign finances. Candidates are not very critical of PACs, and they do not blame PACs for any decline in the strength of political parties or for perpetuating incumbents in office, but 62 percent of them give PACs the credit for escalating campaign costs. More than two-thirds of the candidates agree that campaign contributors, PACs or other, are more likely than non-contributors to get access to policy makers.

Candidates are joined by PAC officers in showing support for placing limits on contributions.

From the days when most PACs merely bought tickets to incumbents' fund-raisers in order to maintain good will, PACs have grown increasingly sophisticated in their operations. One development is the giving of contributions in kind--goods and services rather than money--which not only makes the money go farther, but also gives the PAC some control and involves the PAC's people in the campaign operations. Some PACs at the federal level are going beyond that, to the step of making independent expenditures on behalf of candidates, but there were no such expenditures reported to the PDC by the PACs in 1984 other than mailings listing endorsed candidates which the Washington Federation of State Employees sent to its members and reported as unsolicited independent expenditures.

APPENDIX A: WASHINGTON PACS ACTIVE IN 1984

BUSINESS-RELATED PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 EXPENDITURES

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES 1984	First Filed
ABCPAC - Washington	Associated Builders & Contractors, Inland Empire	\$5,685	82
AWB Caucus Ticket Fund	Association of Washington Business	3,485	78
Affordable Housing Council	Seattle Master Builders	111,035	82
Agriculture for WA	Agriculture	7,369	82
Alaskan Skies Assn.	Alaska Airlines	5,500	*
Alki Foundation	Seattle businessmen	22,752	81
American Insurance Assn PAC	American Insurance Assn	9,025	82
American Sign & Indicator Corp PAC	American Sign & Indicator Corp.	959	*
Architects PAC	American Institute of Architects, Wa Council	4,949	81
Asphalt Paving PAC	Asphalt Paving Assn of Wa	9,505	80
Atlas Associates		1,950	78
BACPAC	Business Advertising Council	483	*
Bar PAC	Wa St Bar Assn	41,220	80
Build East	Assoc'd General Contractors	10,576	*
Builders PAC	Home Builders' Assn of Wa St	2,311	78
Builders United in Legislative Development	Assoc'd General Contractors	21,676	*
Certified Public Accountants PAC	Certified Public Accountants	22,064	*
Citizens for Fair Retailing Practices	Businesses and private identities	7,717	84
Committee for Sensible Waste Management	Washington Waste Management Assn	13,696	*
Committee of Repdems	Wa Assn of Automobile Dealers	101,009	*
Council for Economic Progress	Restaurant Assn of Wa	221,861	*
Energy Associates	Wa Water Power Co	7,452	78
Ernst and Whinney Good Government Fund	Ernst & Whinney, CPA	3,250	84
Fair Competition Council	Private Electric Utilities	69,361	*
Farm Bureau Leg Caucus Fund	Wa St Farm Bureau	356	84
Fishing Vessel Owners PAC	Fishing Vessel Owners Assn	754	84
Forward Spokane	Spokane business	12,583	82
Fuel Distributors PAC	Oil Heat Institute of Wa	2,046	80
Funeral Directors PAC	Wa Funeral Directors Assn	5,552	*
Inland Empire Innkeepers PAC	Wa St Innkeeping Assn.	2,008	84
Insurance PAC of Washington	Insurance and related businesses	14,833	84
Insurance Producers PAC	Insurance agents, brokers, underwriters	21,653	*
King County Industrial PAC	Various industrial businesses in King County	2,425	81
LAWPAC	Wa St Trial Lawyers Assn	113,793	79
Lawyer Representatives Fund		1,959	84

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES	
Life Underwriters PAC		15,640	79
NECA PAC	Natl. Electrical Contractors Assn	3,500	82
NIFM PAC	NW Independent Forest Manufacturers	6,287	80
PTEH Continuing Political Committee	Preston, Thorgrimson, Ellis & Holman (law firm)	11,485	83
Pacific Northwest Off-Road Assn	Pacific NW 4-Wheel Drive Assn & Sand Racing Assn	701	84
Pierce County Affordable Housing Council	Home Builders Assn	11,000	84
Political Action Northwest	none specified	9,416	80
Port Industry Committee	Wa Public Ports Assn	5,534	*
Puget Apartment Operators PAC	Puget Apartment Operators Assn	2,303	79
Puget Power Good Government Committee	Puget Sound Power and Light	8,833	80
RAPAC - Washington	Reynolds Aluminum	853	84
Raleigh Mann and Powell PAC	Raleigh, Mann, and Powell	2,290	82
Realtors PAC WA	Wa Assn of Realtors	259,429	*
Salomon Brothers Inc. PAC	Salomon Brothers Inc.	2,000	83
Seattle & King County Apt Operators' Assn PAC	Seattle & King County Apt Operators' Assn	2,036	84
Shuksan Foundation of Whatcom County	Various businesses	3,560	81
Skagit-Island Builders PAC	Skagit-Island Counties Builders' Assn	50,381	82
Thurston County Affordable Housing Council	Olympia Master Builders	513	84
Titac of Washington	Wa Land Title Assn	3,185	78
Tobacco and Candy PAC	Tobacco and Candy Institute	4,110	*
Trucking Action Committee	Wa Trucking Assn	28,766	*
United for Pierce PAC	Pierce County businesses	1,487	83
United for Thurston County	Thurston County businesses	5,000	82
United for Washington	Washington state businesses	593,536	*
United Telephone Co. of the Northwest	United Telephone Co. of the Northwest	1,050	81
Urban Business PAC	Urban Business Action Committee	1,234	84
Utility Contractors of Washington PAC	Utility Contractors of Washington	5,873	80
WEPAC	Wa Engineers	8,689	78
WSVMA PAC	Wa St Veterinary Medical Assn	22,276	79
Wa Affordable Housing Council	Home Builders Assn. of Wa	37,778	84
Wa Alcoans PAC	Aluminum Co of America	28,866	*
Wa Beer & Wine Wholesalers PAC	Wa Beer & Wine Wholesalers Assn	18,941	84
Wa Cable PAC	Wa St Cable TV Assn	23,612	78
Wa Collectors Assn PAC	Wa Collectors Assn	3,250	84
Wa Compensation Public Affairs Committee	Self-insurers of the state	1,249	84
Wa Consumer Finance Education & Pol. Act Com	Finance and credit companies	4,500	*

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES	
Wa Court Reporters PAC	Wa Shorthand Reporters Assn.	13,123	83
Wa Dairy PAC	Wa Dairy Assn	798	82
Wa Employees Public Interest Committee	Pacific NW Bell Employees	15,072	82
Wa FOODPAC	NW Food Processors Assn & Wa Food Processing Council	12,125	*
Wa Horsemens PAC	Thoroughbred racing and breeding industry	61,696	*
Wa Independent Telephone PAC	Wa Independent Telephone Assn	11,577	80
Wa Manufactured Housing PAC	Wa Manufactured Housing Assn	3,130	82
Wa Mobile Park Owners Assn	Wa Mobile Park Owners Assn	393	81
Wa Natural Gas PAC	Washington Natural Gas Co.	1,352	78
Wa Oil Marketers for Good Government	Wa Oil Marketers Assn	1,033	84
Wa Professional Engineers PAC	Society of Professional Engineers	2,457	82
Wa St Business & Professional Women	Wa St Business & Professional Women	4,703	84
Wa St Pyrotechnics Assn PAC	Wa St Pyrotechnics Assn	12,456	82
Wa St Service Assn	Building maintenance contractors	1,808	83
Yakima Valley Apartment Assn PAC	Yakima Valley Apartment Assn	1,000	82
BANKING:			
715 Associates	Washington Trust Bank	11,535	*
Evergreen Associates	Olympic Bank	4,457	78
First Associates	Officers of Seafirst Corp. & Seafirst Bank	122,678	*
First Interstate Bank PAC of Washington	First Interstate Bank	18,444	81
Home PAC	Vancouver Savings & Loan Assn	1,126	84
Old National Bank PAC	Old National Bank	27,995	82
Pacific First Federal Savings PAC	Pacific First Federal Savings	8,316	84
Peoples PAC	Peoples Bank	5,701	78
Pioneer Associates	Pioneer First Federal Savings & Loan	2,356	80
Puget Sound Bancorp PAC	Puget Sound National Bank	14,192	*
Puget Sound Mutual Bank PAC	Savings Bank of Puget Sound	3,380	77
Pull PAC	Bank of Pullman	100	80
Rainier Bancorporation Associates	Rainier Bank	15,400	*
Savings Assn Voluntary PAC	Savings & loan industry	78,456	78
State Mutual Savings Bank PAC	State Mutual Savings Bank	1,489	82
UnPAC	United Bank	796	80
WFPCA - Wa Federal Savings & Loan	Wa Federal Savings & Loan Assn	2,992	80
Wa Credit Union PAC	Credit Unions	10,921	78
Wa Mortgage Bankers Assn	Wa Mortgage Bankers Assn	11,250	*
Washbank PAC State Fund	Washington Bankers' Assn	11,936	*
WashbankPAC	Washington Bankers' Assn	12,876	*

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES	
Washington Mutual PAC	Wa Mutual Savings Bank	16,540	*
HEALTH CARE:			
Care PAC	Nursing Home Industry	45,471	*
Chiropractors PAC	Chiropractors	132,756	81
Coalition for Responsible Chiropractic	Chiropractic profession	11,200	84
Council of Ophthalmology	Wa St Academy of Ophthalmology	4,915	82
Disabilities PAC		1,011	82
Health Education Fund	Chiropractors	8,719	84
Kitsap Physicians Service PAC	Kitsap Physicians Service	6,021	83
Medical Bureau Network PAC	Wa Physicians Service & Wa St Bureau Managers Assn	22,752	84
Medical Service Corp PAC	Medical Service Corp of Eastern Washington	1,940	84
Podiatry PAC	Podiatrists	7,080	81
PUNCH - Political United Nurses for Consumer Health	Wa St Nurses Assn	8,425	*
Wa Medical PAC	Wa St Medical Assn	147,166	*
Wa Optometric PAC	Optometrists	27,821	*
Wa Pharmacist PAC	Wa St Pharmaceutical Assn	22,947	78
Wa St Dental Hygienists PAC	Dental hygienists	3,764	79
Wa St Dental PAC	Wa St Dental Assn	77,732	*
Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC	Convalescent centers	43,378	80
Wa St Physical Therapy Assn PAC	Wa St Physical Therapy Assn	14,098	82
Washington Medical PAC Tort Reform Fund	Wa St Medical Assn	1,725	83

UNION-RELATED PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 EXPENDITURES

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES 1984	First Filed
Active in Democracy	Tacoma Fire Fighters Union #31	\$10,175	80
Benton Franklin Counties COPE	Benton/Franklin Counties Labor Council	6,517	*
East. Washington Ironworkers PAC	Ironworkers Local #14	281	82
Electrical Workers PAC	Local #46	2,138	84
Faculty & Friends of the UW	University of Washington	8,282	80
I.W.A. Local 3-2 COPE Fund	I.W.A. Local 32	532	*
Intl Fed of Professional & Technical Engineers	Local #17	4,600	*
Intl Union of Operating Engineers	Local #286	255	82
Joint Labor Association	Nine local union chapters in Tacoma	1,050	81
King County COPE	King County Labor Council AFL-CIO	22,972	*
Laborers Local #348	Laborers Local #348 PAC	1,434	82
Local 302 Voluntary PAC	Operating Engineers	29,989	*
Lower Columbia Ironworkers PAC	Ironworkers Local #29	2,115	82
Millwrights & Carpenters PAC	Union construction workers	207	82
OCAW Wa St Political Coalition	Oil Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union	9,100	80
Pierce County COPE	Pierce County Central Labor Council AFL-CIO	9,299	*
Political Action by Concerned Employees (PACE)	Wa Public Employees Assn	240	*
Political Unity of Leaders in State Education (PULSE)	Washington Education Assn	555,694	*
Public Employees Action Committee	Public School Employees of WA	211,212	78
Skagit Valley Carpenters PAC	Skagit Valley Dist. Council of Carpenters	775	84
Spokane COPE	Spokane Labor Council AFL-CIO	5,656	77
Spokane County Deputy Sheriffs' Assn	Spokane County Deputy Sheriffs' Assn	514	84
United Food & Comm'l Workers Active Ballot Club	Local #381 UFCW	400	84
United Steelworkers of America	Subdistrict #7	8,779	*
Wa & N Idaho Dist Council of Laborers	Wa & N Idaho Dist Council of Laborers	1,288	83
Wa Federation of State Employees	State Employees Union	440,575	*

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES	
Wa Federation of Teachers PAC	Wa Federation of Teachers AFL-CIO	10,808	*
Wa PACE (Political Action for Candidate Elections)	Social workers & friends of social issues	3,128	80
Wa Public Employees Assn Program Fund	Wa Public Employees Assn	598	84
Wa St Assn of the U.A. Code & Legislative Committee	Plumbers & Pipefitters	62,387	*
Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee	Wa St Labor Council	191,363	*
Wa Teamsters Legislative League	Joint Council of Teamsters #28	29,887	*
Wa St COPPS (Council of Police Political Support)	Wa St Council of Police Officers	9,628	82

LOCAL UNITS OF WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Central Valley Education Assn PAC	2,090	79
Chinook Uniserv Council PAC	15,052	77
Duwamish Uniserv Council	4,472	82
Eastern Washington Uniserv Council PAC	16,912	77
Edmonds Education Assn	3,331	77
Fourth Corner PULSE	9,810	77
Highline Education Assn	3,145	*
Kennewick Education Assn	463	*
Kent Education Assn	5,124	*
Lower Columbia Uniserv Council PAC	5,093	78
Midstate Uniserv Council PAC	13,250	80
Mukilteo Education Assn	656	77
N Central Wa Uniserv Council PAC	3,890	79
Northshore Education Assn PAC	4,284	*
Olympic Uniserv PAC	10,804	*
Pilchuck Uniserv Council PAC	10,620	78
Political Review of Bellevue Educators	3,293	*
Puget Sound Uniserv Council PAC	10,690	78
Rainier Uniserv Council PAC/PULSE	8,681	84
Riverside Uniserv Council PAC	7,302	*
STA PAC	11,473	*
Sammamish Uniserv Council PAC	10,076	80
Shoreline Education Assn PAC	3,580	*
Soundview Uniserv Council PAC	5,952	80
Southeast Wa Uniserv PAC	7,381	77
Spokane Education Assn PAC	8,052	*
Summit Uniserv Council PAC	9,203	77
Tacoma Assn of Classroom Teachers	6,055	78
Teachers in Politics (Vancouver)	1,855	81

MISCELLANEOUS PACS IN WASHINGTON STATE, 1984 EXPENDITURES

COMMITTEE NAME	AFFILIATION	EXPENDITURES 1984	First Filed
Asian Pacific PAC		44	78
Concerned Christian Citizens for Political Action		5,881	80
Gun Owners' PAC of Washington		110	84
Human Life PAC		14,596	80
Metro Elections Committee of the South Sound		617	84
Northwest Black Non-Partisan Assn		2,165	78
Pierce County Civic Improvement Committee		721	84
Right to Bear Arms Political Victory Fund		19,037	78
SEAMEC (Seattle Municipal Elections Committee for Gays)		4,006	80
SUPPORT		57	80
Senior Citizens Lobby		10,707	80
The Native American Alliance for Political Action		96	84
The Washington Family Council PAC		675	84
Thurston County Women's Political Fund		2,019	84
Wa Environmental PAC		16,810	82
Wa St Natl Abortion Rights Action League PAC		5,285	82
Wa St Natl Organization for Women		7,971	82
Wa St Women's Political Caucus Campaign Fund		11,070	*
Wa Taxpayers Assn PAC		1,686	78

NEW POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEES REGISTERED IN 1985

Power P.A.C.

Vancouver

Purpose: to see biblical principles back into government at all levels

United Food & Commercial Workers Local 44 Political Candidates Fund

Mt. Vernon

Affiliation: United Food & Commercial Workers Local 44 AFL-CIO

RHOS-PAC

Seattle

Affiliation: Rental Housing Operators of Seattle

Builders PAC of Kitsap County

Port Orchard

Affiliation: Home Builders Assn. of Kitsap County

Northern Life Insurance Co. State PAC

Seattle

Affiliation: Northern Life Insurance Company

Public Safety Employees, Local 519

Seattle

Affiliation: Public Safety Employees Local 519

Parents PAC of Washington

Vancouver

Related committee: Fathers PAC (Aloha OR)

Friends of Washington PAC

Issaquah

Purpose: to promote and support the Community Plan Process

Seattle Fire Fighters' Political Action Fund

Seattle

Affiliation: Seattle Fire Fighters Union Local 27 IAFF, AFL-CIO

W.A.S.T.E. Washington Assn of Serious Taxpayers for the Environment

Vancouver

Purpose: oppose transportation of Oregon garbage to Washington

ILWU Northwest Political Action Committee

Seattle

Affiliation: International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union

Forward Highline PAC

Seattle

Affiliation: Greater Highline Chamber of Commerce

Wa Osteopathic Physicians & Surgeons PAC

Seattle

Affiliation: Washington Osteopathic Medical Association

Committee for the Wise Use of Energy

Tacoma

Affiliation: Washington Natural Gas Company

Northwest Natural Gas Company

Foster, Pepper & Riviera Political Action Committee

Seattle

Affiliation: Foster, Pepper & Riviera (law firm)

APPENDIX B:

SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES REPORTED BY 20 LARGEST PACS, 1984

RECEIPTS

EXPENDITURES (Incomplete)

Affordable Housing Council

From 278 individuals & firms	\$113,458	To legis. candidates	\$42,099
Sales	21,892	Other contributions	51,656
Carried forward from 1983	4,299	To parent organization	4,695
Interest income	1,959		
Total Available 1984	\$141,607		

Bar PAC - Wa St Bar Assn

From 570 members	\$ 25,933	To legis. candidates	\$33,228
Carried forward from 1983	24,429	Other contributions	3,780
Interest income	2,388		
Total Available 1984	\$ 52,749		

Care PAC

From 40 individuals & firms	\$ 23,758	To legis. candidates	\$26,950
Carried forward from 1983	22,144	Other contributions	15,075
Interest income	559		
Total Available 1984	\$ 46,462		

Committee of Repdems

From 252 auto dealers & dealer assns	\$ 94,828	To legis. candidates	\$ 9,950
Carried forward from 1983	16,958	To support Init. 464	88,381
Interest income	845		
Miscellaneous income	310		
Total Available 1984	\$112,941		

Council for Economic Progress

From 448 individuals & firms	\$153,877	To legis. candidates	\$ 26,450
Carried forward from 1983	8,497	Other contributions	25,491
Miscellaneous income	215	Lobbying expenditures, including dinner and reception	69,107
Total Available 1984	\$162,590		

RECEIPTSEXPENDITURES (Incomplete)Fair Competition Council

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 37,592	To legis. candidates	\$ 65,450
From 4 private utility firms @ \$9,000	36,000	Other contributions	2,915
Total Available 1984	\$ 73,592		

First Associates

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 64,801	To legis. candidates	\$ 54,375
From 490 individuals	62,895	Other contributions	68,065
Total Available 1984	\$127,696		

LAW PAC

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 74,856	To legis. candidates	\$ 70,999
From 166 individuals, firms and partnerships	51,720	Other contributions	33,165
Interest income	5,861		
From parent organization	3,000		
Total Available 1984	\$135,437		

Public Employees Action Committee

From PSEA	\$181,258	To legis. candidates	\$ 50,875
Carried forward from 1983	43,086	Other contributions	38,876
Interest income	4,595	Lobbying	79,068
Sales	2,508		
Total Available 1984	\$231,446		

PULSE (Wa Education Assn)

Dues from 29,443 members @ \$13	\$382,759	To legis. candidates	\$ 90,300
Carried forward from 1983	111,303	Other contributions	141,084
Loan proceeds	55,000	Transfer to local action funds	140,840
Other dues transferred from local units	24,055	Board expenses	16,453
Interest income	8,358	Advertising & public relations	15,563
Total Available 1984	\$581,475	Polling	8,280

RECEIPTSEXPENDITURES (Incomplete)RPAC WA (Realtors)

From 3991 individuals & firms	\$167,099	To legis. candidates	\$108,800
Carried forward from 1983	94,686	Other contributions	68,424
From parent organization	12,637	To Nat'l Assn of Realtors	54,407
Interest income	9,306	Fund-raising costs	18,636
Total Available 1984	\$283,728		

SAVPAC - Washington Savings League

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 59,370	To legis. candidates	\$ 53,400
From 500 individuals	18,789	Other contributions	23,180
From 20 other PACs	18,374		
Interest income	4,506		
Miscellaneous income	188		
From parent organization	22		
Total Available 1984	\$101,248		

United for Washington

From 811 individuals & firms	\$384,561	To legis. candidates	\$380,546
Carried forward from 1983	189,091	Payroll	116,208
Interest income	23,913	Computer	11,873
Miscellaneous income	11,396	Commissions	7,864
Loan proceeds	7,222	Poll	4,000
Total Available 1984	\$616,183		

Wa St Assn of the UA Plumbing & Pipefitting Industry

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 52,923	To legis. candidates	\$ 12,860
From 11 local unions	49,209	Other contributions	16,236
Interest income	2,859	Lobbyist salary & expenses	29,744
Miscellaneous income	480		
Total Available 1984	\$105,471		

Wa St Dental PAC

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 58,219	To legis. candidates	\$ 56,925
From 1188 individuals	49,660	Other contributions	9,255
Interest income	4,903	To parent organization	
Total Available 1984	\$112,782	for lobbying	10,000

Wa St Health Facilities Assn PAC

From 139 individuals & firms	\$ 40,933	To legis. candidates	\$ 27,200
Carried forward from 1983	9,502	Other contributions	16,100
Total Available 1984	\$ 50,435		

RECEIPTSEXPENDITURES (Incomplete)Wa St Labor Council PPP Committee

From 143,800 individual members & 555 organizations	\$244,406	To legis. candidates	\$ 88,036
Carried forward from 1983	109,057	Other contributions	105,092
Interest income	5,033		
Total Available 1984	\$358,497		

Wa Affordable Housing Council

Carried forward from 1983	\$ 20,488	To legis. candidates	\$ 26,125
From parent organization	19,630	Other contributions	2,750
From 132 individuals & firms	15,391		
Interest income	1,494		
Total Available 1984	\$ 57,002		

Wa Federation of State Employees

From approx. 16,921 members @ \$1.10 mo.	\$223,345	To legis. candidates	\$215,787
From AFSCME	123,417	Other contributions	80,104
Carried forward from 1983	45,730	Staff salaries & expenses	96,477
Other dues transferred from local units	23,371	Printing	6,379
Interest income	7,316	Phone	6,447
Miscellaneous income	245		
Total Available 1984	\$423,424		

Wa Medical PAC

From 1453 individuals	\$ 91,990	To legis. candidates	\$103,680
Carried forward from 1983	55,829	Other contributions	35,861
Total Available 1984	\$147,819	Consulting	3,938